

Classical Philology

VOL. III

July, 1908

No. 3

DE EURIPIDIS STHENEBOEA

BY ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF

Ut felix ager cultori annuam messem fert, sic Aegyptiae harenae nova quotannis librorum Graecorum fragmenta doctis fossoribus obferunt. Sed ne in bibliothecis quidem spicilegium infructuosum esse cum alii nuper experti sunt, tum Hugo Rabe, rhetoricae Byzantinorum artis explorator indefessus. Cui modo contigit ut trium adeo Euripidis fabularum multos versus ederet (Mus. Rhenan. LXIII p. 145 sqq.), tradita in Iohannis diaconi et logothetae commentario in Hermogenem scripto, ex quo cum excerpta quaedam in marginibus codicis Laurentiani 56, 1 ad Gregorii Corinthii commentarium adscripta essent, poteramus ex eo edere Welckerus Stheneboeae argumentum, ego adulescentulus Pirithoi. Apparet autem me errasse, cum suspicarer seris rhetoribus argumenta tantum tragoediarum praesto fuisse, quae simul cum multis versibus descripta sunt e codice Euripideo, non quidem ab Iohanne, sed ab antiquiore rhetore, quinti opinor aut sexti saeculi.¹ Nam superfuisse tunc plerasque Euripidis fabulas folia docent Melanippae captivae Berolinensia, Phaethontis Parisina.

De Pirithoo et Melanippa philosopha dicere nunc in animo non est, nisi quod emendatiunculae aliquot infra marginem ut admittantur pudenter rogant;² sed Stheneboeae et argumentum et pro-

¹ Haud aliter iudicandum de Augae argumento in Mosis Chorenensis Progymnasmatibus servato.

² In Pirithoo Hercules dicit "Eurystheus me iussit Cerberum arcessere ἰδεῖν μὲν οὐ θέλων, ἀθλον δέ μοι ἀνήνυτον τὸν δῶκεν ἐξηνκέσαι." nihili est hoc ultimum perfectum

logum adscribam necesse est. Distinguo membra orationis clausulis rhythmicis distincta, videtur autem is qui veteris argumenti verba his numeris adstringebat, ubi ultimum accentum duae syllabae secuntur, ante eum singulas aut ternas syllabas accentu carentes tolerasse. Ceterum praetereo pauca ac levia Laurentiani ope emendata.

Προῖτος ἦν Ἀβαντος¹ υἱὸς Ἀκρισίου δὲ ἀδελφὸς βασιλεὺς δὲ Τίρυνθος. γήμας δὲ Σθενέβοιαν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγέννησε παῖδας, Βελλεροφόντην δὲ φεύγοντα ἐκ Κορίνθου διὰ φόνον αὐτὸς μὲν² ἤγαγε τοῦ μύσους, ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν ξένον ἠγάπησε, τυχεῖν δὲ μὴ δυναμένη τῶν ἐπιθυμημάτων διέβαλεν ὥς ἐπιθέμενον αὐτῇ τὸν Κορίνθιον. πεισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Προῖτος ἐξέπεμψε αὐτὸν εἰς Καρίαν ἵνα ἀπόληται, δέλτον γὰρ αὐτῷ δοὺς ἐκέλευσε πρὸς Ἰοβάτην διακομίζειν. ὁ δὲ τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἀκολουθεῖν πράττων προσέταξεν αὐτῷ διακινδυνεύσαι πρὸς τὴν Χίμαιραν. ὁ δὲ αγωνισάμενος τὸ θηρίον ἀνείλε. πάλιν δὲ ἐπιστρέψας εἰς τὴν Τίρυνθα κατεμέμψατο <μὲν> τὸν Προῖτον ἀνέστεισε δὲ τὴν Σθενέβοιαν ὥς <εἰς> τὴν Καρίαν ἀπάξων. μαθὼν δὲ παρ' αὐτῆς³ ἐκ Προῖτου δευτέραν ἐπιβουλὴν φθάσας ἀνεχώρησεν. ἀναθέμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Πήγασον τὴν Σθενέβοιαν μετέωρος ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἦρθη. γενόμενος δὲ κατὰ Μῆλον τὴν νῆσον ταύτην ἀπέριψε. αὐτὴν μὲν οὖν ἄλιεῖς ἀναλαβόντες διεκόμισαν εἰς τὴν Τίρυνθα. πάλιν δὲ ἐπιστρέψας ὁ Βελλεροφόντης πρὸς τὸν Προῖτον πεπραχέναι ταῦτα αὐτὸς ὡμολόγησε. δις γὰρ ἐπιβουλευθεὶς πρὸς ἀμφοτέρων

sive sententiam, sive tempus, sive metrum spectas; corrupti igitur titubans scribae memoria alium perfecti infinitivum propter antecedens ἀνήντων. Contra ἀνήντων τόνδ' integrum est: nihil aptius demonstrativo pronomine. Sequebatur igitur bisyllaba verbi finiti forma a vocali incipiens. Quae cum perspexerimus recuperamus ἀνήντων τόνδ' ὡς ἐξηγητέον.

Melan. 11—ἀλλ' ἀνοστήεις λόγος ἐπ' ὄνομα τοῦμόν, κείσ' ὁθενπερ ἠρξάμην. Traditum λόγος ὄνομα τε. 16—ἔμουν ἦδε χρησμοειδὸς βροτοῖς ἀκη πόνων φράζουσα. Peccant qui ante ultimum senarii pedem interpungunt. βροτοῖς igitur quamvis ἀπὸ κοινοῦ positum in pronuntiando cum ἦδε potius coniungitur. Qualia grammatico gratissima tantum e severissimam cuiusque poetae usu dici possunt. Constat autem Euripidem ante ultimum senarii pedem non interpunxisse. 19—μυσεῖον ἐκλιποῦσα Κωρύκιόν τ' ὄρος. Hoc esset "relinquens Museum et Corycium montem." Quale Museum? Reliquit Musis sacrum Corycium montem. Sublata copula simul tollitur anapaestus.

¹ Ἀβαντος, Nauck. Ἀκάμαντος, Iohannes.

² αὐτὸν μὲν cod. correxi, terminationes casuum antiquitus non fuisse scriptas codicum discrepantiae ostendunt.

³ παρ' αὐτοῦ cod. παρὰ του male Rabe, ut solent multi intempestivo obsoleti pronominis amore decipi.

δικην εἰληφέναι τὴν πρέπουσαν, τῆς μὲν εἰς τὸ ζῆν τοῦ δὲ εἰς τὸ λυπεῖσθαι. εἰσάγεται γοῦν ὁ Βελλεροφόντης λέγων καθ' ἑαυτόν.

Οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις πάντ' ἀνὴρ εὐδαιμονεῖ·
ἢ γὰρ πεφυκὼς ἐσθλὸς οὐκ ἔχει βίον,
ἢ δυσγενὴς ὢν πλουσίαν ἀροῖ πλάκα,
πολλοὺς δὲ πλούτῳ καὶ γένει γαυρουμένους¹

5 γυνὴ κατήισχυν' ἐν δόμοισι νηπία·
τοιαῖδε Προῖτος [ἄναξ νόσωι νοσεῖ²]

ξένον γὰρ ἰκέτην ταῖσδ' ἐπελθόντα στέγαις³
λόγοισι πείθει καὶ δόλῳ θηρεύεται
κρυφαῖον εὐνῆς εἰς ὀμιλίαν πεσεῖν.

10 αἰεὶ γὰρ ἥπερ τῶιδ' ἐφέστηκεν λόγῳ⁴
τροφὸς γεραιὰ καὶ ξυνίστησιν λέχος
ὑμνεῖ τὸν αὐτὸν μῦθον “ὦ κακὸν φρονῶν
πιθοῦ· τί μαίνῃ; τλήθι δεσποίνης ἐμῆς⁵”

κτῆσαι δ' ἀνακτος δώμαθ', ἐν πεισθεὶς βραχύ.”⁶

15 ἐγὼ δὲ θεσμούς Ζῆνά θ' ἰκέσιον σέβων⁷
Προῖτόν τε τιμῶν, ὅς μ' ἐδέξατ' εἰς δόμους
λιπόντα γαίαν Σισύφου φόνων τ' ἐμὰς
ἔνιψε χεῖρας αἰμ' ἐπισφάξας νέον,
οὐπώποτ' ἠθέλησα δέξασθαι λόγους

20 οὐδ' εἰς νοσοῦντας ὑβρίσαι δόμους ξένος,⁸
μισῶν ἔρωτα δεινόν, ὃς φθείρει βροτοὺς
[διπλοῖ γὰρ ἔρωτες ἐντρέφονται χθονί·

¹ v. 1. εὐδαιμονῶν. v. 3. δυσμενῆς. v. 4. τιμωμένους cod. Omnia emendata leguntur in fgm. 661. 62.

² Non sufficit versum facere suppleto γῆς. Requiritur loci indicatio ac deinde ipse Bellerophon et suum et Steneboea nomen spectatoribus notum fecit. Nam prologorum Euripideorum consuetudo constans atque certa est. Lacunam ab interpolatore male resartam ludendo explere nolo.

³ τῆσδ' ἐ. στέγης. Malui pluralis quam singularis dativum restituere.

⁴ κορυφαῖον et τῶδ' ἐφέστ. correxit Rabe.

⁵ ὦι κακῶς φρονῶν πείθῃ. emendavi. Deinde versum excidisse indic. Rabe, veluti πόθοισιν εἴκειν. μὴ κακὴν αἰδῶ τρέφε.

⁶ δῶμα πεισθεὶς τι βραχύ, correxi; quamquam ubicumque interpolator grassatus est, omnis restitutio incerta.

⁷ θεσμούς Rabe, θεοὺς cod.

⁸ νοσοῦντος corr. Brinkmann.

- ὁ μὲν γεγὼς ἔχθιστος εἰς "Αἰδην φέρει]¹
 ὁ δ' εἰς τὸ σῶφρον ἐπ' ἀρετὴν τ' ἄγων ἔρως
 25 ζῆλωτος ἀνθρώποισιν· ὦν εἶην ἐγώ.
 οὐκουν νομίζω [καὶ θανεῖν γε σωφρονῶν],²
 ἀλλ' εἰς ἀγρὸν γὰρ [ἐξείεαι βουλήσομαι].³
 οὐ γάρ με λύνει τοῖσδ' ἐφήμενον δόμοις
 κακορροθεῖσθαι μὴ θέλοντ' εἶναι κακόν,
 30 οὐδ' αὖ κατειπεῖν καὶ γυναικὶ προσβαλεῖν
 κηλῖδα Προΐτου καὶ διασπάσαι δόμον.

Bellerophon qui haec verba facit Stheneboeae amorem reppulit, sed calumniis ab eadem nondum petitus est, nedum in Lyciam missus cum Chimaera confixerit. Eodem igitur actionis momento et tragoediam ordiri animadvertimus atque argumentum. Quod modo persequamur, lineamenta iustae tragoediae facile apparent. Quam plane singulariter compositam fuisse mirati mox perspicimus fabulam ita exorsam ne potuisse quidem aliter disponi. Agedum umbram eorum excitemus quae Athenienses in scaena spectaverunt.

Postquam Bellerophontes exiit, Proetus Stheneboeae calumniis excitatus in Cariam⁴ eum misit, ut ab Iobate occideretur. Quae duas ut minimum scaenas requirebant. Magnus deinde temporis hiatus, si verum rimamur, complurium mensium. Atque curavit poeta ut spectatoribus narraret quae interim gesta essent. Hic enim locum habebant nobilissima illa fragmenta quibus (a nutrice nimirum) Stheneboeae angores et desideria describuntur

¹ Versus a Christiano interpolatos esse monui (noveram enim ex alio codice) in Actis Academ. Berol. 1907, 4. Christianorum enim "Αἰδης ille est, in quem incidunt qui mala libidine ducuntur. Fortasse iam dixeris fragmenta versuum male suppleta esse. Nam poterat Euripides scribere *διος γὰρ εἰς ἔρως ἐν βοτῶν γένει, ὁ μὲν γεγὼς αἰχιστος ἐλέθριός θ' ἄμα*. Me tamen ut in priore sententia perstem maxime vox *ἔρως* adducit in extremo versu 24 collocata.

² Balbutiens interpolator his dicere volebat "ego vel mortem obeundam esse censeo, ut castitas servetur." Euripides dixerat "itaque cedere nequitiae nolo." Restituere servato *νομίζω* non potui.

³ Haec quoque interpolatio manifesta, *ἐξίω* fortasse probabile; verbi restitutio incerta, donec proximi versus sententia recuperata sit. Videtur Euripidis codex, quo is qui primus haec excerpserit utebatur, mutilus fuisse, nam interpolationes Johanne certe antiquiores sunt.

⁴ Cariam pro Lycia appellat poeta. Nimirum Lycii usque ad annum 439 Cariae provinciae ab Atheniensibus erant attributi.

(fm. 663-65). Quasi alterum prologum habemus. Deinde Bellerophontes victor e Caria redit, facinora sua describit, Proeto perfidiam exprobrat, ab eodem novis insidiis petitus Stheneboeae cuius indicio servatus erat, simulato amore persuadet, ut Pegaso vecta se in Asiam comitetur. Pegasus autem ipsum in ea scaena inductum esse in qua Bellerophontes victoriam de Chimaera reportatam narrabat, novo fragmento edocti sumus, quod nuper Photius Berolinensis obtulit,

παῖω Χίμαιραν εἰς σφαγὰς, πρὸς δ' Ἀθήρ
βάλλει με καὶ τοῦδ' αἰθαλοῖ πυκνὸν πτερόν.¹

Qui Pegasus ligneus esse vix poterat (risissent opinor Athenienses), sed equus verus alis ornatus, quem manu ducebat histrio: nobilem equum libenter commodabat choragus, libentissime spectabat populus equitandi studio ardens. Atque ingeniosissime ita ea praeparabantur quae mentis tantum oculis mox erant spectanda. Machina enim Bellerophontis tragoediae quam in Pace imitatus est Aristophanes, ab hac fabula cum aliis de causis tum propterea aliena fuisse censenda est quia verus inducebatur equus; nec bis idem placuisset artificium.

Rursus hiat tempus. Prodeunt deinde piscatores qui ad Melum insulam Stheneboeae a Bellerophonte praecipitatae corpus invenerant. Audimus eos in fm. 669 vitae marinae angustias describentes: perlustra ceteros Euripidis nuntios, nihil reperies quod cum his piscatoribus comparare possis. Denique Bellerophontes ipse redit Tirynthios de iusta ultione certiores facturus quam de Proeto et Stheneboea sumpserit. Debebat etiam discessurus indicare quo proficisceretur, nempe in regnum Asianum modo victoriis partum. Haud dissimilis hic ultimus actus est earum tragoediarum in quibus deus ex machina iudicium de rebus gestis fert et futura praenuntiat. Sed necessaria hic sunt et ipsa actione postulantur quae ibi frigida esse solent et ab actione quam ratio postulat abhorrent. Nonne probabile Stheneboeam aetate omnes illas tragoedias antecedere? Inveniendi

¹Emendavi *Χίμαιρας* et *αἰθάλην* in Actis Berol. 1907, 4. Non huius nuntii est fgm. 669, sed potius eius scaenae in qua Bellerophontes Stheneboeae iter suscipiendum describit. Fm. 667 ad Proetum in altera utra altercatione dixit. Fm. 666 secundum Stobaei codicem Bellerophontis est, cui fidem derogare non audeo.

audaciam in iuvene Euripide admiramur: audacter pleraque in Stheneboea novavit. Nam Bellerophontes quidem cum Pegaso inde ab Hesiodo nobilissimus est maxime inter Corinthios eorumque vicinos,¹ nec nobilitatem per Iliadem solam adeptus est quae Pegasum ignorat. Sed perfidae mulieris, qualis Homeri Antia est, in Corinthiorum fabulis partes fuisse neque demonstrari potest neque negari, nam Stheneboeae nomen Euripides Antiae primus substituere poterat, siquidem Proeti uxor hoc nomine in alia tunc celeberrima fabula utebatur, quae est de Proeti filiabus (Apollod. Biblioth. II 26, III 102), quod nomen in Argolide natum esse fidem faciunt Iuppiter *σθέλιος* Argis, Minerva *σθενίς* Troezene culti compluresque Stheneli Argivi. Sed ut Stheneboea ante Euripidem cum Bellerophonte coniuncta fuerit, statuenda tunc est ipsa sibi mortem conscivisse, hoc enim mythographi tradunt.² Id vero quod gravissimum est, Stheneboeam a Bellerophonte decipi abduci interfici, Euripidis est commentum. Quod omnino ignoraremus, nisi servatum esset argumentum. Ignoramus igitur quid in Bellerophonte tragoedia actum sit, nisi quod mores herois e fragmentis aliquatenus perspicimus, qui taedio generis humani correptus caelum petit quaesiturus sintne dei an non sint, ac deinde deiectus in terram per Erroris campum claudicans mendicus incedit. Unde id certe colligimus, continuari non solum res in Stheneboea gestas, sed virtutis parum humanae quam in illa tragoedia iactaverat in hac eum poenas dare. Accedit quod hic Pegaso insidens spectatur. Quibus omnibus commoveor ut Stheneboeam ante Bellerophontem compositam esse credam. Nam casu tribuendum quod haec in Vespis demum, Bellerophontes iam in Acharnensibus commemoratur. Utramque cum Phaethonte et Alcestide felicissimam adolescentis poetae artem nobis referre existimo; sed Bellerophontes iam ad Cretensium et Medae acerbiter propius accedit.

Sed praeterii adhuc id quod maxime novum et paene incredibile nos docuit prologus. Nemo enim aut suspicatus est aut sus-

¹ Nec tamen Graecum heroem eum esse credo, nihil enim probat quod Corinthus, colonia Romana eum coluit. Ipsum nomen et portentosa capra quam portentoso equo insidens obruncat Cariam, sive Minoam aut Aegeam dicere mavis, originem prae se ferunt.

² Schol. Aristoph. Ran. 1043. Hyginus fab. 57. 243. Nicolaus Damascenus fr. 16.

picari poterat, temporis quam dicere consuevimus unitatem ab ullo Graecorum tragico tam graviter laedi potuisse. Nam postquam Bellerophontes in Cariam abiit non tantum menses aliquot praeterlabuntur, sed Stheneboea longo tempore mutata est cum denuo in scaenam prodit. Deferbuit ira, paenituit eam fraudum, rursus amat quem culpa sua interfectum credit. Confiteor me ne somniando quidem fingere posse, quomodo Euripides transitum scaenarum, sive actus dicere mavis, instituerit. De choro omnino nihil scimus; sed sive mansit ille in scaena sive abiit, pariter hoc abhorret ab omni tragicorum usu. Compara Agamemnonem: inane tempus est quod inter nuntium Troia facibus transmissum et praeconis adventum interiacet, atque divino cantico a laetitia sensim ad dira praesagia traducimur. In Sophoclis Trachiniis Deianirae rebus adeo tenemur, ut ne quaeramus quidem quam procul Cenaenum Trachine absit. Audaciorem se praestitit Euripides in Andromacha, neque laudamus quod Orestam Pharsalo Delphos abeuntem facit ut Neoptolemum occidat et cantico interiecto nuntium caedis illius inducit. Sed hoc tantum cum extrema Stheneboeae parte componi potest, in qua mulieris quae modo discesserat corpus Melo statim adportatur. Prius autem temporis intervallum quo magis id consideres eo memorabilius videtur. Diceres tripartitam fabulam quasi trium esse dierum, diceres Calderoniane fecisse Euripidem. Neque absurde mihi videor hoc quoque a trilogiarum usu repetere, sicut olim feci, cum Persas Aeschylī, item tripartitam tragoediam, explicabam.¹ Quantopere gavisus esset Lessingius, si in impugnandis Cornelii unitatibus Stheneboea uti potuisset. Quamquam fatendum est, non Corneliū aut Aristotelem sed ipsos tragicos libertatem poeticam tetricis legibus coercuisse, quibus maxime effectum est, ut post Sophoclem et Euripidem tragoedia nihil procrearet duraturum. Utinam plura resuscitentur laetiorum temporum documenta, quae adulescentes spectabant eosdem poetas liberrimo pede avia Pieridum loca peragrantes.

Corollarii loco paucis de alio commentarii Iohannei loco agere libet, qui sive e chrestomathia Procliana sive e consimili enchi-

¹ In Hermae, Vol. XXXII, 382. Errorem quo commovebar ut Persas primum Syracusis actam putarem, correxi in Actis Berolin. 1901, 1284.

ridio rarissima haec de tragoediae Atticae primordiis excerpit testimonia. Leguntur haec apud Rabium, p. 150. τῆς οὖν κωμωδίας οὕτως εὐρεθείσης ἵνα μὴ πάντῃ διάχυσις γένηται, τὴν τραγωιδίαν εὐρήκασι τὸ συνωφρυνόμενον καὶ κατηφές ἐκ ταύτης εἰσφέροντες. ἄμφω δὲ παρ' Ἀθηναίους ἐφεύρηται, καθάπερ Ἀριστοτέλης φησίν. ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι πρῶτοι γεγόνασι. διὸ καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει μαρτυρητέον τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν μαθημάτων καὶ σπουδαιότατα. τῆς δὲ τραγωιδίας πρῶτον δρᾶμα Ἀρίων ὁ Μηθυμναῖος εἰσήγαγεν, ὥσπερ Σόλων ἐν ταῖς ἑπιγραφόμεναις Ἑλεγείαις ἐδίδασκεν, Χάρων (Δράκων cod.) δὲ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς δρᾶμά φησι πρῶτον Ἀθήνησι διδασθῆναι ποιήσαντος Θέσπιδος. Omnia nova sunt. Nam ab Atheniensibus inventas esse et tragoediam et comoediam etiam in Poetica contra Doriensium vindicias adserit Aristoteles; sed tamquam agriculturae, matrimonii, omnis denique humanitatis auctores Athenienses terrae filios tantum in dialogo poterat laudare. Alterum est quod Charo Thespidem primum tragicum in annales suos rettulit. Ergo Herodoti aequali idem annus notus erat quem nobis quoque chronica Graeca praebent. Tamen nuper Thespidem fuisse negabant, et multi etiam post inventam Aristotelis Rem publicam commenticium dicunt quidquid non in Herodoto aut Thucydide est. At hercle, si ante Hellenicum Charo fasti Atticis usus est, fuerunt fasti, etiamsi nondum in publicum editi; atque si Thespidis annus definitus erat, Pisistrati aequalis anni non minus erant definiti. Denique Solo in elegiis Arionis mentionem fecit talem, ut videretur τραγωιδίας δρᾶμα ei tribuere. Quod cum quale traditur credi nequeat, quomodo intellegendum sit, ex eis facile colligitur quae apud Suidam de Arione leguntur, λέγεται δὲ καὶ τραγικοῦ τρόπου εὐρετῆς γενέσθαι (καὶ πρῶτος χορὸν στήσαι καὶ διθύραμβον αἶσαι καὶ ὀνομάσαι τὸ αἰδόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ) καὶ σατύρους εἰσενεγκεῖν ἔμμετρα λέγοντας. Cancellis saepsi quae ad Herodotum redeunt; reliqua Solonis reddunt testimonium. Dixerat ergo aliquo modo, Arionem τραγικὸν τρόπον coluisse aut τράγους i. e. σατύρους canentes induxisse. Rem ita se habere et Aristotelem qui tragoediam e dithyrambo prodisse vult cum his optime conspirare probe intellexeramus; sed quanti est Solonis aequalis testimonio Arionis tragica carmina confirmari.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF CATULLUS

BY WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

In the *Classical Review* for April, 1906, I published a paper entitled "Catullus Once More." In this, I corrected certain readings which appeared to me erroneous in Ellis's new edition, and which I saw must cause R temporarily to be misjudged, summarized my convictions about the relations of R to other MSS, including M, and announced that a year's leave of absence for the re-examination of my work upon R and the study of the entire tradition had been granted me by my university. Later, the university appointed Mr. B. L. Ullman, long trained in my Catullus courses, as research assistant to aid me.

The programme has been carried out in substance. Beginning in March, 1907, I have spent nine months in Europe (my time being necessarily reduced), and Mr. Ullman has spent over a year and a half, beginning in the summer of 1906. In addition, another student of the same training, Mr. Evan T. Sage, has rendered me the great service of devoting three months, in the spring of 1907, to the collation of Catullus manuscripts. Among us, we have collated all the manuscripts of the existence of which we have been able to get information.

By far the larger part of the secondary MSS were collated by Mr. Ullman, some of them in consultation with me (in the course of which my great confidence in his perspicacity and judgment was fully confirmed), but many necessarily without consultation. I have myself, besides collating various secondary MSS, studied anew O, G, R, and M, with a large expenditure of time. Each of these four manuscripts, too, Mr. Ullman and I have finally gone over together, line by line, after he had made preparatory studies, and after many previous discussions of difficult individual points.

My purpose in the present paper is to publish a preliminary list of MSS, asking for information in case any reader knows of other MSS, and to discuss a few points of especial interest.

In the paper cited, as in earlier papers (thus in *Hermes* XXXIV, pp. 133-44) I have stated these principal convictions:

G and R are not direct copies of Ver. (the "lost Verona manuscript"), but of a copy of this, which for convenience I have called *alpha*. This (likewise lost) manuscript was sent to Coluccio Salutati in consequence of the well-known letters to Benvenuto of Imola and Caspar of Verona written in 1374 and 1375 (the first and third on p. xvi of Schwabe's generally very careful edition are assigned to the wrong years). The text of *a*, not of G, was finished on October 19, 1375—a date which fits sufficiently well the date of the latest letter of Coluccio.

All our other MSS (with the exception of T) are descended from O, G and R—principally from R, with a certain amount of crossing from O and G, and a great deal of crossing to and fro in the sub-families descended from R. Compare the following:

cii. 1: *ab antiquo* OGR, *ab amico* R² cett.

lxxviii. 9: *Verum id non* O, *Verum non id* G, *Id uerum non* R cett.

lxxvi. 11: *offirmas* OG, *affirmas* R cett.

lxxxviii. 4: *quantum* O G Ricc. 606, *quantum* D (the archetype of D and Ricc. 606 was partly derived from G), *tantum* R, corrected to *q^{ant}um* (= *quantum*) by R¹ (but in such a way that the long stroke of the letter *q*, which letter was meant to cover the *ta*, could easily be read as only a deleting stroke for the *a*), *tantum* cett.

If this tenet is sound, only that part of the tradition which is found in O, G or R can possibly be genuine, and critical editions will ultimately give the readings of O, G and R alone. My present larger acquaintance with the MSS tends to confirm this conviction.

Our editors have in general given us only scattering readings outside of O and G, while maintaining or assuming that *any* MS cited by them might yield us, at this and that place, the genuine tradition or a hint of it, as against O and G. My opposing conclusion was based upon complete collations of twenty-two MSS and two partial MSS, and it is to these that I refer in the "cett." above. But I desired a fuller knowledge, feeling that the first critical problem, namely what MSS we are to start from in reconstituting the text, could not finally be settled until we could control a much larger number. Ultimately, I could not content myself with less than all. Before my assistant and I began the work of

collation, I had made out, partly by the help of old editions of Catullus (as Sillig's), partly by searching old editions of Tibullus or Propertius, a list of 96 MSS (Heyse, 1855, mentions 50, and says that some 70 exist). This subsequently, in a few cases by chance information, but mainly by the ransacking of catalogues, rose to the number of 120 MSS (not including the Florilegia, etc.) a few of them fragmentary. I possess complete collations now of all but Paris. 8231 (fragmentary), seventeenth century; Ashb. 973, sixteenth century; Brancaccianus IV, A. 4. (fragmentary), seventeenth century; Vatic. lat. 7044, sixteenth century; and an eighteenth-century copy made for Santen (see list below). These, except the last, contain readings seemingly gathered from every quarter, and, in the press of time¹ and in view of their complete worthlessness for my purpose, the five were not collated (specimens only being taken), though two seventeenth-century MSS (fragmentary), contained in Ricc. 2242, were collated in full. New collations were made of the twenty-four manuscripts which had been collated by or for me before.

Through the courtesy of M. Léon Dorez, Don Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, and the editors of four English journals, I have advertised for information about any MSS outside of a list given for France, Spain, and Great Britain and Ireland respectively. But even for these countries, it is quite possible that my list is incomplete; while it is more than possible that MSS still remain for Germany, Italy, Switzerland, or Russia. There is nothing from the two last-named countries. I should be greatly obliged for supplementary information, which should be addressed to me at the University of Chicago. I should be glad, also, to receive help with regard to any of the unidentified MSS or unfound material given at the end.²

I have been obliged to dispense with dealing with hand-notes found in the margin of printed editions and purporting to give

¹The mere task of collation occupied what corresponded to the entire work of one man for two years and six months.

²I take the opportunity to thank Professor Jacoby of Kiel for his courtesy. He had not happened to see my paper in the *Classical Review*. Before allowing a student of his, however, to go to Rome to study R for the purpose of writing a dissertation upon it and its relations to other MSS, he wrote to me to ask whether I was continuing my work, and, upon learning the facts, at once withdrew his student.

readings from MSS, though I have done enough to make it seem probable that nothing is to be gained from this source. If someone should undertake the work with a different result, I should be glad to be found wrong.

In the list that follows, the initials C T P stand for Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius respectively. The sign + means that more or less from other literature, generally humanistic, is also contained in the MSS against which it appears. The other abbreviations explain themselves.

PRELIMINARY LIST OF CATULLUS MSS

AUSTRIA

VIENNA

K. K. Hofbibliothek

224.—C. T. P.

3198.—C. Petron. T. +. Ann. 1440(?).

3243.—C. (frag.) +

BELGIUM

MONS

Bibliothèque de la Ville

218. 109.—T. C. P. +

FRANCE

CARPENTRAS

Bibliothèque de la Ville

361.—C. T. P.

GRENOBLE

Bibliothèque de la Ville

858.—C. T. P. Ann. 1472.

PARIS

Bibliothèque Nationale

7989.—T. P. C. Petron. +. Ann. 1423.

7990.—T. C. P.

8071.—Iuu. C. (frag.) +

8231.—C. (frag.) +. Seventeenth century.

8232.—C. Verg. Priap. +

8233.—C. T. P. Ann. 1465.

8234.—T. C.

8236.—P. T. C. Verg. Priap.

8458.—T. P. C. +

14, 137.—C. Ann. 1375(?).

GERMANY

BERLIN

*K. Bibliothek**Diez. B. Sant. 36.*—C. +*Diez. B. Sant. 37.*—C. +. Ann. 1463.*Diez. B. Sant. 40.*—C.*Diez. B. Sant. 46.*—C. (Made at end of the eighteenth century for Santen.
Probably a copy of the Edinburgh MS, then belonging to the
church of S. Giovanni a Carbonara, Naples.)*Diez. B. Sant. 56.*—C. Ann. 1481.

DRESDEN

*K. Öffentl. Bibliothek**Dc. 133.*—C. P. T.

GÖTTINGEN

*K. Universitäts-Bibliothek**Philol. 111^b.*—T. P. C. +. Ann. 1456(?).

HAMBURG

*Stadtbibliothek**Scriu. 139. 4^o.*—T. P. C.

MUNICH

*K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek**lat. 473.*—C.*lat. 7471.*—C. (carm. xlix only).

WOLFENBÜTTEL

*Herzogliche Bibliothek**65. 2. MSS.*—C. T. P. +*Gud. 283.*—C.*Gud. 332.*—T. C. +

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

CHELTENHAM (ENGLAND)

*Phillipps Library**3400* (apparently *Saibant. 323*).—C.

DUBLIN (IRELAND)

*Trinity College Library**1078* (formerly *Phillipps 9590*).—P. C.

EDINBURGH (SCOTLAND)

*Advocates' Library**18. 5. 2.*—C. Ann. 1495(?).

LISCONNAN (IRELAND)

*Library of Samuel Allen, Esq.*P. T. C. Verg. Priap. + (apparently *Phillipps* 6433). Ann. 1467.

LONDON (ENGLAND)

*British Museum*10, 386 (apparently *Saibant*. 329).—C. Ann. 1474.

11, 674.—T. C.

11, 915.—C.

12, 005.—Mart. C. (frag.).

Burn. 133.—C.*Harl*. 2574.—T. P. C. +*Harl*. 2778.—P. C.*Harl*. 4094.—C. (frag.) +*Lincoln's Inn, Library of Walter Ashburner, Esq.*

C. (to lxi. 134) T. (from ii. 4, 13). Ann. 1451.

OXFORD

*Bodleian Library**Lat. class. e.* 3.—T. P. C. +*Lat. class. e.* 15 (formerly *Phillipps* 3364).—C. +*Lat. class. e.* 17 (formerly *Phillipps* 9591).—C. T. +. Ann. 1453.*Canon. lat.* 30.—C.*Canon. lat.* 33.—T. C.*Canon. lat.* 34.—C. T. Verg. Priap.*Laud. lat.* 78.—T. C.

RICHMOND

Library of Sydney C. Cockerell, Esq.

C.

HOLLAND

LEYDEN

*Universiteits-bibliotheek**Voss. Lat. in Oct.* 13.—T. P. C. +*Voss. Lat. in Oct.* 59.—T. C. +. Ann. 1453.*Voss. Lat. in Oct.* 76.—C. T. Ann. 1451.*Voss. Lat. in Oct.* 81.—Verg. Priap. Verg. + Petron. C. T. P.

ITALY

BERGAMO

Biblioteca Civica

Σ. 2. 33 (3).—T. P. C. +

BOLOGNA

Biblioteca Universitaria

2621.—C. Ann. 1412.

2744.—C.

BRESCIA

Biblioteca Civica Queriniana

A VII. 7.—P. C. T. +

CESENA

Biblioteca Comunale e Malatestiana

XXIX. sin. XIX.—C. T.

FLORENCE

Biblioteca del fu Signor Landau

306. 314.—T. C.

*R. Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana**Plut.* XXXIII. cod. XI.—C. P. T.*Plut.* XXXIII. cod. XII.—C. T. Ann. 1457.*Plut.* XXXIII. cod. XIII.—C. Pers.*Plut.* XXXVI. cod. XXIII.—Ou. Fasti, C. +*Strozz.* 100.—C. (carm. xlix only) +*Ashb.* 260 (apparently *Saibant.* 324).—C.*Ashb.* 973.—C. Sixteenth century.*R. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale**Magl.* VII. 948.—Pers. Iuu. C. +. Ann. 1476.*Magl.* VII. 1054.—T. C.*Magl.* VII. 1158.—C.*Panciat.* 146.—Verg. Priap. T. C. +. Ann. 1475.*R. Biblioteca Riccardiana*

606.—C. T. +

2242. No. 25.—C. (carm. lxiv only) +. Seventeenth century.

2242. No. 25 bis.—C. (carm. lxiv only) +. Seventeenth century.

GENOA

*Biblioteca Civica*MS. D^{bis} 4. 3. 5.—T. C.

MILAN

Biblioteca Ambrosiana

D 24 sup.—C.

G 10 sup.—T. C. (frag.) +

H 46 sup.—P. T. C. +

J 67 sup.—C. P. T.

M 38 sup.—C.

R. Biblioteca Nazionale di Brera

AD. XII. 37 No. 2.—T. C. Ann. 1450 (?).

NAPLES

R. Biblioteca Brancacciana

IV. A. 4.—C. (frag.) +. Seventeenth century.

Biblioteca Oratoriana de' Gerolimini (Filipina)

MSS. membr. XIII. Pil. X. No. XXXIX.—P. C. T. Stat. Siluae.

Ann. 1484.

R. Biblioteca Nazionale

IV. F. 19.—C. T. P. +

IV. F. 21.—C. P.

IV. F. 61.—C. +

IV. F. 63.—Stat. Achill. Ou. C. (frag.) +

PADUA

Biblioteca Capitolare

C. 77.—P. C. +

PALERMO

Biblioteca Comunale

2 Q. q. E. 10.—T. C. +

PARMA

R. Biblioteca Palatina

H H. V. 47 (716).—P. C. T. Ann. 1471.

PESARO

Biblioteca Oliveriana

1217.—C. T. P. +. Ann. 1471.

ROME

R. Biblioteca Casanatense

15.—T. P. C. (frag.).

Biblioteca Chigiana

H. IV. 121.—C. T.

Biblioteca Corsiniana

43. D. 20.—T. C. +

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Barb. lat. 34.—T. P. C. +

Ottob. lat. 1550.—C. P. +

Ottob. lat. 1799.—C.

Ottob. lat. 1829.—C.

Ottob. lat. 1982.—C. (frag.) +

Palat. lat. 910.—T. Ou. P. C. +. Ann. 1467(?).

Palat. lat. 1652.—T. C. P. +

Urb. lat. 641.—C. T. P.

Urb. lat. 812.—C.

Vatic. lat. 1608.—C. Verg. Priap. Ann. 1479.

Vatic. lat. 1630.—Plaut. C.

Vatic. lat. 3269.—C. Verg. Priap. +

Vatic. lat. 3272.—P. T. C. +

Vatic. lat. 3291.—Lucr. Pers. Verg. Priap. C. T. +

Vatic. lat. 7044.—C. Ann. 1520.

S. DANIELE

Biblioteca Civica

56.—P. T. C.

SIENA

*Biblioteca Comunale**H. V. 41.—C. +*

VENICE

*Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana**lat. 12. 80.—C.**lat. 12. 81.—T. C.**lat. 12. 86.—Ou. C. +**lat. 12. 153.—T. C. +**Museo Civico**MS. VI. No. 117. 549.—T. P. C. +*

VICENZA

*Biblioteca Comunale Bertoliana**G. 2. 8. 12.—T. C. P. +. Ann. 1460.*

SPAIN

EL ESCORIALE

*Real Biblioteca**IV. C. 22.—T. C. P. +**IV. C. 22.—C. (in same volume as the above).*

FLORILEGIA AND EXTRACTS

AUSTRIA

KRAKAU

*Universitäts-Bibliothek**No. 3244. DD. XII. 15.—Selecta Phalericorum (sic). Q. Valerii Catuli, Veronensis.*

FRANCE

MARSEILLES

*Bibliothèque de la Ville**1283.—Extracts. Seventeenth century.*

NICE

*Bibliothèque de la Ville**In schol. ad Iuu. (See Beldame Rev. de Phil. VI. 76).*

ITALY

ROME

*R. Biblioteca Casanatense**904.—Florilegium sententiarum ex latinis scriptoribus excerptarum.**Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana**Vatic. lat. 7192.—Extracts. Sixteenth century.*

VERONA

Biblioteca Capitolare

CLXVIII (155).—Flores moralium autoritatum. Ann. 1329.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

LONDON

British Museum

[21,908.—fol. 45 v. Benvenuto de Campesanis, Ad patriam, etc.]

MSS AND OTHER MATERIAL NOT FOUND
(OR NOT IDENTIFIED)MSS of D. Baldassarre Boncompagni (catalog. ed. E. Narducci, 1862)
No. 219.—Extracts. Seventeenth century.

Saibanti and Canonici MSS (sale catalogue, Sotheby, 1821):

No. 95.—C. P. paper. Sixteenth century.

No. 96.—C. P. paper.

No. 431.—P. C. (*Phillipps 9590?*)Vatican, Rome (Müntz-Fabre, La bibliothèque du Vatican au xv s., École française de Rome 1887, p. 101), Poeta Caculi boronensis (*sic*).

2 MSS Collegii Jesuitarum, Rome (Heyse, p. 288 implies one. A MS note on the title-page of the Corradini edition in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Rés. gYc 223, mentions two, describing the first as "olim Biburgiensis," paper, containing T. C. On first fol. v there is a note, "Tibullus et Catullus exemplare Michaelis Angeli e Decimis de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri." The second MS was of parchment, written in 1460 by Joannes Carpensis (is this the Carpensis referred to in MS notes to Cat. vii. 9 and elsewhere in this edition?). See also the Parma edition of 1794, p. vi).

Cavrianeus (Heyse, p. 288).

2 Bossiani (Heyse, p. 288).

Library of Nicolaus Trivisanus.—C. T. parchment (Tomasini, Bibliothecae Patavinae manuscriptae publicae et priuatae, 1639, p. 107).

Library of Federico Ceruti Veronensis (Tomasini, Bibliothecae Venetae 1650, p. 98). Catullus num. 3 (Leyden Voss. lat. in oct. 76 formerly belonged to Ceruti).

Tournay, Belgium: Inter MSS codices Dionysii Villerii . . . nunc Ecclesiae Cathedralis . . . (Bibliotheca Belgica, Sander, 1641, p. 219).

London: in aedibus Iacobaeis (MSS Angliae, T. ii p. 247, No. 8236).

"Angeliani 2 simul conglutinati, memb., quorum primus integrum exhibet C., secundus non nisi tria eiusdem poetae elegidia cum nonnullis Ovidii poematis, et veterum epigrammatum libello. Habuit hos olim in domestica bibliotheca Antonius Angelius, qui seculo xvi humaniores literas in Pisana urbe docuit" . . . (C. T. P. Parma edition, 1794, p. vi).

C. T. P. Parma edition, 1794, p. v: "Res igitur nobis fuit pene ex integro conficienda: Catulli codices plures e pulvere et situ evocandi: dispiciendi veteres libri: in aliorum interpretamenta, aut coniecturas curiosius inquirendum. . . . Quae omnia quum fusius alibi simus exposituri, deque toto Veronensis poetae exornandi apparatu uberim dicturi . . ." (was a second volume of notes ever published?).

Codex Petri Flerardii (Rob. Titius, *Loc. controv. lib. ix, c. 21*).

Paul Heyse, *Nachlass über Catull*.

My preference would be to deal with the whole of my material first, testing completely my tenet that all the other MSS come from OGR, and publishing the evidence. But this will cost a good deal of time, and my collation of R has been long delayed. I therefore shall assume that the result will be as I have thought, and, as announced some time ago, shall publish a continuous restored text of the lost Verona MS, with the readings of O G and R below. There will be a number of corrections of previous reports upon O, and a larger one of those upon G.

I wish now to make a few remarks upon my paper in the *Classical Review*, and to add a supplementary report upon several other points of especial interest.

Of the three great MSS, O is to my mind the oldest in its style of writing, R the next, and G the youngest. But of course the actual order of writing may have been different. An older man and a younger may, on the same day, write hands belonging to fashions separated by many years.

Certain things in the ornamentation of the first initial in O, if contemporaneous with the text, preclude a date much before 1400. The question whether these are original could be settled only by expert students of illumination.

With a feeling that the style of the writing allowed a date fifty years earlier than had been assigned to it, I surmised that O might have been Petrarch's copy, and made this suggestion in my paper in the *Classical Review*, discussing the matter no further. The principal reason for this ascription was the resemblance of the "Catullus Veronensis poeta" written (partly in abbreviations) at the top of p. 1 by a hand different from that of the corrector and

from that of the annotator. Several distinguished scholars have agreed that the writing might be Petrarch's. The light curving and rising final stroke of the *e*'s, the long sweep of the *uirgula*, and the angle of the two strokes of the *a*'s, are in Petrarch's manner. But other experts have differed; and I am myself now convinced that the movement of the writing is somewhat freer than Petrarch's. It was always a difficulty, too, that notes in Petrarch's style of comment were lacking in the margins. Further, several of Petrarch's readings in his quotations differ from those of O; and Petrarch, if he had made the emendations involved, would have been very likely to note them in his manuscript. I therefore withdraw my suggestion.

Less credit may in consequence at first be given to another assignment which I have for some years been inclined to make, and which, after very careful comparisons, I now publish with confidence. The "corrector" of R (*R*²) was its owner, Coluccio Salutati. The MSS most serviceable to me in the identification have been a MS of Seneca's tragedies and the *Ecerinis* of Mussato in the British Museum (11,987), written throughout by Coluccio and signed by him at the end, and a MS of Petrarch's *De Viris Illustribus* in the Vatican (Ottob. 1883), which, beside other marginal notes, has many by Coluccio. The resemblances are complete, not only in the style of the letters (some of which have very marked peculiarities), but in the manner of making the frequent braces, the drawing of the pointing hands, and the character of the many examples of .Nō. used for the same purpose.

I am also convinced that Novati is wrong (*Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati* I. 222, footnote 2) in attributing the ownership of G, on the basis of notes which he does not specify, to Coluccio. The hands of G² and Coluccio are similar, but not the same. G was perhaps, or probably, written in Coluccio's office, but it was not corrected by him.

In the article in the *Classical Review* I gave specimens of the proof of what I had before said in several places, that M is a direct copy of R. I then supposed that the scribe of M had G also before him, and that he selected a few readings from it, though in the great majority of cases following R.

I also said, apropos of an indisposition to welcome R which has shown itself in certain quarters, that "the actual facts with regard to the relation of G and R will prove to be so dramatically overwhelming in favor, not only of R's position as a primary MS, but of its high position, that I am enabled easily to bear the present prevailing skepticism." I further said that G and R had too many corrections in common for chance, and hinted that G had been corrected upon R, giving as an illustration the readings, xiv. 16, *fit* O G, *sit* G² R (both readings being wrong). To this I may here find space for a single other specimen. In lxiv. 355, O has *prosternet* (right) and G originally had it; but G is corrected to the wrong reading *prosternens*, which is the original and untouched reading of R (by the second hand, supplying verses omitted by the scribe). Cases like this outweigh a few others, in which R is corrected to the *right* reading, found also in G.

But there is another possibility, of a still more disturbing kind, which must also be reckoned with, namely that G may have been corrected upon M; with which must go the conclusion that the text of M was not based upon R and G, but upon R alone. The facts mentioned are equally well explained upon this hypothesis, since, in the main, M is a pretty exact copy of R. Thus in the passages mentioned M has *sit* and *prosternens*. We come to this question presently. Meanwhile, let it be understood that most of the descriptions about to be given bear upon it; and, further, that the present discussion is necessarily provisional, not final, and that the figures are subject to slight changes.

In R, after the verses of Benvenuto, we read *Catulli Veronensis liber incipit ad* (perhaps *Ad*) *Cornelium*, written by R² in one line, and apparently at one time. G has, by the first hand, *Catulli Veronensis liber Incipit*, with a period. To this G² adds, in the same line, *ad Cornelium*, with an additional period.

It will be remembered that, in many cases where there are no interstices between poems in O and G, G has a paragraph mark in the margin. O, in almost every such instance, has two light lines of equivalent force. In all these cases, R has an interstice, and, generally, a catch-title in black in the margin, and a title in red in the interstice, both by the second hand.

The exact agreement of O and G as regards the interstices makes it morally sure that they represent the arrangement of the poems in Ver. The departure of R in giving an interstice wherever there was a sign of division was then due to a deliberate plan. In one place, at xxxviii, R rightly separated a poem where G has no paragraph mark, though O has the two lines. In accordance with his usual custom in such cases, R indented three verses, and began with *Ale est*, putting an *m* in the margin to guide the illuminator. R² made a condemnatory note upon this in the margin, and, after certain erasures, filled in the reserved spaces in the verses. He then expunged the whole of the first verse and added a *uacat* (*ua* at the beginning and *cat* at the end of the verse). This being done, he wrote the verse anew in the interstice, thus closing up the page to the eye. The interest in the matter lies in the indication that G² did not get his paragraph marks from his archetype, but from R or a descendant of R, and in the fact that, in doing his correcting, R² wrongly repeated the *est* from verse 1 in filling up the reserved space in verse 2, thus making the reading *Male est si*, from which the reading in nearly all our manuscripts comes.

Several of the earlier titles in G are by the first hand. Thus *De phasello* was written in the interstice before iv. R has the catch-title *de phasello* in the margin by the first hand, and the title *De faselo* in the interstice by the second hand. In the interstice before v, the first hand in G wrote *De lesbia*, which is corrected by the second hand to *Ad lesbiam*. In R, the first hand wrote *de lesbia* in the margin, and the second hand wrote *Ad lesbiam* in the interstice—evidently a correction of the probably inherited title written by R¹. Before vi, G wrote a title of which enough remains to make it morally sure that it was *Ad se ipsum*. G¹ changed this to *Ad Flauium*. R has in the margin *ad se ipsum*, probably by the first hand, to which, farther out in the margin, the second hand added *ad flauium*, evidently again a correction. In the interstice, the second hand wrote *Ad Flauium* (possibly with a small *f*).

For xvii, G has the paragraph mark in the margin, and R an interstice, but neither has any title.

For xxii, R² wrote *Ad suffenum* in the margin, but afterward crossed out the second word, replaced it by *Varum*, and, when he came to fill in the titles in red, wrote *Ad Uarum* in the interstice. G² wrote *ad Varum* in the margin.

For the last two words of xxxii. 1, R² wrote a variant *al' Ipsicilla*. Opposite the interstice he wrote a catch-title *Ad Ipsicillam* in the margin, and in the interstice *Ad ipsicillam*. G² wrote the title *Ad Ipsicillam* in the margin, though the last words of G's first verse are *ipsi thila*, corrected by G² from *ipsi thili* (*ipsi Thila* in R, *ipsi illa* in O).

For xxxv, R² wrote *Ad libellum suum de cecilio* in the margin (this comes down in substance in the CLA family), and *Ad Cecilium iubet libello loqui* in the interstice. G² wrote *Ad Cecilium Iubet libello loqui* in the margin.

For xlix, M and two unreported MSS which have come directly down from R by separate traditions, apart from the main MSS, show that the original title was pretty surely *Ad romulum*. This corresponds in length to an erased catch-title in the margin of R, and an erased title in the interstice. G doubtless had originally the same, since G² and R² everywhere else agree in the titles.

From lxii inclusive on, R² wrote titles in the interstices only.

Before lxxvii, O, G and R have an interstice. R has *ad ruffum*, probably by the first hand, in the margin, and *Ad Rufum*, by the second hand, in the interstice. G has *Ad Rufum* by the second hand in the interstice. The interest here lies in the appearance of a title by the first hand of R so late in the MS.

In R, titles are lacking in the interstices only for vii (*ad lesbiam* in the margin), viii (*ad se ipsum* in the margin), xvii (nothing in the margin), and before the wrongly separated *At pater ut summa*, etc., lxiv. 241, for which a hand later than R² has written, in the margin, *Fletus egey*, which does not appear in M. G² has put his regular paragraph mark in the margin, but gives no title. O has no indication of any division. Thus where R² has a marginal title, but none in the interstice, G² has written the same title in the interstice; and where R² has written no title, G² has written none.

To state conclusions briefly, it looks as if the titles written by

the first hand and corrected by the second in G had been corrected from R or M, and as if the titles by the second hand in R, except those which appear in the first hand in the interstices in G or the first hand in the margin in R, had been invented by R² (mainly on the basis of vocatives, which appear generally in the first lines of the poems in such cases), and copied¹ by G² from R, in the form which R² ultimately decided upon, or from M, which everywhere follows the title finally adopted by R².

At first thought, it would seem to be easy to decide which of the two MSS G² had used. But it proves to be difficult.

The close connection of G² and M is obvious enough, and appears in many places. Examples follow:

liii. 3: *crimina* OGR; *al' carmina* G²; *carmina* M.

lxi. 61: *Nichil* OGR; *Nil* G² M; *al' nihil* M².

lxiii. 13: *dindimene* OGR; *dindimenee* G² M.

lxiii. 91: *dindimei* OGR; *dindimenei* G² M; *al' dindimei* M².

lxiv. 307: *His* OGR; *al' hic* G²; *Hic* M.

Such cases are indecisive. M may have chosen the variant or corrected reading of G² for the reading in his text, or G² may have taken his variant or correction from the reading in M's text.

From the very large number of cases (more than 70) where the corrected readings in the text of G and R agree with each other and with the readings in the text of M, there is likewise no conclusion to be drawn for our question. G² may have corrected G upon R, or upon M.

The field where we should look for evidence is in the behavior of M (the scribe writing the text) where G and R (or R²) differed. There are about 130 examples like the following:²

lxi. 5: *Hymen* O; *hymenee hymen* ORM; *O hymenee hymen* G.

lxvi. 83: *colitis* OG; *queritis* RM.

lxviii. 51: *Nam* ORM; *Non* G.

¹ Bonnet *Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature*, 1877, 1, 57, rightly says that the titles in G must have come from some other MS, and suggests that their source was some other copy of Ver. Giri *De Locis qui sunt aut habentur corrupti in Catulli carminibus*, p. 15, likewise says that G's titles were taken from another MS, and suggests B, or some other source of the same kind. Both were right in their main point. But B does not satisfy the conditions, and the source also turns out not to be an independent copy of Ver.

² Examples where the differences are only in spelling are not included. But note xvii. 6, where M writes *sali subsali*, mistaking the *ci* of R's *sali subscili* for an *a* (M² adds *al' subscili*), and xxviii. 2, where OG have *sarcinulis*, and RM *sarcinolis*.

On the other side are to be considered the cases following, in which M agrees with G or G¹ against R or R². I arrange them by groups:

- A. xxi. 6: *experibis* OR; *experibus* G M; *al' bis* G² M².
 xcv. 1 and 5: *Zinirna* OGRM; *Zmirna* R²M². Similarly in 6: *Zinirnam* OGRM; *Zmirnam* R²M².
 lxiv. 52: *littore*, O; *litore* G; *litora* R; *litora* M; with *e* written above the *a* by M².
- B. xxxix. 12: *lamuiuinus* OG; *lanuiuinus* R; *lamuiuinus* or *lamiuinus* (no apex present) M; *lamuiuinus* M¹.
 [lxiv. 180: *ne* OGRM; *ue* R¹M²; *ue* a late hand in R.]
 lxiv. 211: *uisere* OR; *uiscere* GM; with the *s* deleted by a line by G², and expunged by M¹.
- C. lxi. 151: *tuus* O, and R² correcting himself; *tuis* GR² (R omitted the verse) M.
 lxiv. 123: *in memori* OR; *in memori* G; *al' nemori* G²; *in nemori* M; corrected, by an added stroke, to *in memori* M².
 lxiv. 176: *requisisset* OGR; with an *r* written above the first *s* by G²; *requirisset* M; corrected to *requisisset* by M².
 lxiv. 282: *pit* OGRM²; *parit* G²M.
- D. lxiv. 360: *flumina* OR; *lumina* G; *al' flumine* G²; *flumine* M; *al' lumina* l. *flumina* M¹.
 xcvi. 4: *carpatias* O; *carpatians* R; *in marg. carpatinas* (no *al'*) R²; *carpatiās* G; *carpatians* M; *al' carpatiās* M².

The first example under D proves conclusively that the corrector of M had G before him, and, if this is so, M also may easily, though not necessarily, have had G before him.

In the second under D, M² probably meant *carpatinas*. Compare his *sub tegmiā*, so written in lxiv. 347, though elsewhere spelled out.

The first example under A seems to indicate that M used G. Yet just as *experibus* was a sheer blunder in G, due to the fact that *-ibus* is a common termination, it may conceivably be merely a coincident blunder in M. M makes many worse blunders. Moreover, the same reading *experibus* is found in Leidensis 76, a MS of the BAV family which stands in no close relation to G, and which therefore probably owes the reading to the repetition of the same blunder.

From the *Zinirna*, -am, examples under A, if the whole argument turned upon them, M would seem to have had G before him. Still, a certain amount of individual decision must be allowed for in the case of every scribe. It was easy to see what the three words had originally been in R, and M may have been copying from R alone, but in the present place have preferred the uncorrected readings to the corrected. This is as easy to suppose as that he preferred G's uncorrected to R²'s corrected readings.

In the third example under A, the correction by M² is a simple and easy one, and in so far of less weight.

The examples under B are inconclusive. The change from *ne* to *ue* in R in the second example is not in the style of R² (it may conceivably be by M², who did at any rate add a variant or two¹ in R; or it may be by another hand, not much later). Yet, even if one assigns the change to R², M, as above, may have preferred the original reading of R to the obviously corrected one (made by a heavy stroke below, with no erasure of the full connecting stroke of the *n*). The third example under B likewise means little, since spelling in these MSS is largely a matter of individual habit. A large accumulation of such cases would have weight. A single one has practically none. The first example is likewise not worth much, since *lanuvinus* is so written in R that it could easily be read *lamiuvinus*. Indeed, Ellis in his recent edition cites R as having "*fortasse*" *lanuvinus* (probably an error in transcribing *lanuvinus*), though it *certainly* has the last-named reading. Similarly, all editors up to the present time have reported *irru-masti* for G in xxviii. 10, though it unquestionably has *irruinasti*.

The first example under C indicates that M used G, unless Coluccio added the correction in R *after* M was copied, or unless (more probably) the *tuis* in M is an accident, of a kind that frequently recurs elsewhere. Thus in ix. 8 R wrote *ut mos est tuis* (corrected by R²), though the agreement of OG in the right reading makes it morally sure that *a* had *tuus*.

The second and third examples under C indicate that M had G² before him, unless G was corrected upon M before the corrections

¹ *Al' crude*, lv. 16, and *al' tibi*, lxiv. 276, were *not* written by R², and are completely in the style of M².

(which are sound and easy ones) were made in M by M². The fourth example points to the same alternatives, though with less force, since the interpretation of the particular abbreviation used is always uncertain (cf. *seperata* and *separata* in certain MSS of the BAT family in xvii. 19).

We have to chose, then, between the two following hypotheses:

I. M used both R and G, after both had been corrected.

II. a) M was copied from R (and possibly before the death of Coluccio, 1406, who in that case may have made a correction or two *after* M was written).

b) The owners of M and G lent each other their MSS. The corrector of M (who may well have been the owner) took a reading or two from G, which MS may have been only recently written, or have been written earlier, and, like O, have been left uncorrected. I incline toward the latter hypothesis. The flourishes above the tall letters in the first line of each page point to the execution of the text in a chancery. The most probable hypothesis is that G was copied in Coluccio's office upon the arrival of a; that he then, looking at it and being dissatisfied with the irregular arrangement of interstices and titles, gave orders to another scribe to make another copy, which was R; that Coluccio adopted this, corrected it, and put upon it, in his regular manner, its number in his library and the indication of the number of folios contained ("71 carte 39," written in Coluccio's hand at the top of p. 1 of the text).

c) After the corrector of M had used G, the owner of G in turn borrowed M, and the corrector (who may again have been the owner) thoroughly revised his MS upon the basis of the other, getting from it the paragraph marks, the changes in the text which are in his hand, and the variants. To these, he added certain corrections of his own, not found in M; and the corrector of M similarly added a few corrections in the latter after its return to him, perhaps casually in the course of a fresh reading.

For the first alternative (I) as against the second (II), the only evidence of weight, unless I have overlooked something, lies in the first and second examples under A and the second under B (supposing that it was R² who changed *ne* to *ue* in the last-named). The readings here, as already said, may be otherwise

explained. Against this alternative is the fact that the total possible number of cases on this side is so small, while in all the remainder, out of a total of more than 140, M followed R or R², not G.

In favor of the second alternative (II) there are several facts, or sets of facts.

The hypotheses (under *b* and *c*) that M² used G in an uncorrected state, and that G², after correcting G upon M, made further corrections in the former, is in harmony with the facts in several passages. Thus in xi, G R M have 23 and 24 written as one verse, while G² separates them. In li, G R M have *Te* in 4, while G² carries it back to the end of 3. In the same poem, R has *Ille michi* and M *Ille mihi*, while G² has *Ille mi*, with a space after the second word which would easily catch the attention of anyone who was examining a manuscript for corrections to his text. It is hard to believe that M², if he had found these sound corrections in G, would not have adopted any of them. Similarly G²'s correction of the second *nichil* in xlii. 21 to *nil*, though G² selected the wrong word, would have been likely to set either M or M² to thinking.—These, it should be noticed, are all metrical corrections, and the first three are sound.

The hypothesis that G² used M is in harmony with one striking fact in the metrical notes, which in all three manuscripts are by the second hands. In general, M² agrees with R², even to the varying spellings and misspellings, as *Faulecij endecasillabi* by both for v (G² *Faleuticus Endecasillabus*), *Faleucij endecasillabi* by both for vi (G² *Faleuticus endecasillabus*), and *Faleuciū endecasill'* by R² and *Faleuciū endecasillabum* by M² for xiv (G² *Faleuticū endecasillabū*). In the long note for xi, M² agrees with R², while G² has a somewhat differing text, though the same in substance. But in the note for ii, G² and M² have *Genus metri* (Met¹ G²) *Faleuticum endecasillabum* (with a period after *metri* in M), while R² has *Faleuticum endecasillibum* (*sic*). A careful examination shows that four lines have been erased in the metrical note in M. There are sufficient traces left to make clear that what was first written was the entire metrical note (a long one) for the *first* poem. The explanation is simple. In R the

poem of Benvenuto (*Ad patriam*, etc.) comes first, so that the metrical note for *i* stands opposite the second poem. M^2 , working hurriedly, copied this note against the second poem of his MS, saw his mistake, noticed that the first four words would correspond in meaning to R^2 's metrical note for the second poem, erased the rest, and then copied the long note over again, placing it against the first poem, where it belonged. G^2 copied the note thus left by M^2 for the second poem. If he did this, clearly he got his metrical notes from M , though varying them in form where he chose. No other hypothesis will account for the agreement of G^2 and M^2 in the one place where M^2 has blundered, and the agreement of R^2 and M^2 in detail elsewhere.

Another set of facts remains to be considered. G and R always write *e*, not *ae* or *oe*, for these diphthongs. In 11 places, beginning at xlv. 9, G^2 has added a hook to an *e*, to represent the diphthongal spelling. R^2 has the hook in 7 places, 4 alone being in the text. In none of these is there coincidence with G^2 's hook. Neither corrector, then, got his suggestion from the work of the other.

In all the places where G^2 writes a hook, M has the full spelling, with separated letters. This cannot be an accident, in view of the close relations independently determined. One worker must have followed the other. Did M follow G^2 , or did G^2 follow M ?

M 's spelling fluctuates. The commonest form is the single letter. But in 66 cases he writes a diphthong with separated letters, joined letters, or *e* with a hook (6 cases only being of the last kind). Of these, 6 occur before G^2 begins to write the hook, 44 in the space covered by his hooks, and the remainder, 16, after he has stopped all corrections.¹ Clearly, then, M was not accepting suggestions from G^2 , but G^2 was accepting suggestions from M , that is, G^2 was using M .

¹ G^2 let 6 cases of diphthongal spelling in M go by (4 of *quae*, 1 of *haec*, and 1 of *pene*), added the hook first at a word (*coetus*) where M 's letters were large and striking, and then kept up his corrections intermittently until he stopped his work completely, confining them, however, to the words *caelum* and *caelestis*, *coetus*, *coepit*, and *proelium*, in various inflectional forms, and *haec*. He covers every case of *coetus* (5), *caelum* and *caelestis* (1 each), *coepit* (2), *proelium* (1), and 1 case of *haec* out of 11, accepting no case of *quae*, which occurs 18 times in the same space along with abundant instances of *que*).

Finally, a general survey of the treatment of the variants may throw light upon our question.

In order to hold that M used G and R, as against holding that G² owes the mass of his work to M, and the rest to his own fancy, we should be driven into the following combination of hypotheses:

M put the work of R above that of G, and followed the former in all but the dozen cases given above (p. 249), out of more than 140. But he at the same time set a singularly high value upon the judgment of the *corrector* of G, which led him in several cases to adopt the reading of this man's variant, as against the reading of the scribe of R—in other words, he used the MS G for the sake of its corrections, not for its text. He was also able to distinguish between the variants by G² and those by G¹ (though no modern scholar succeeded in doing this before Bonnet), and to avoid adopting the latter, as in the case of *al' q̄* iii. 14, where G¹ alone was right. He was able also to distinguish where G² had made changes in the text of G, and so to follow his lead as against R, as in the cases of *dindimenee* and *dindimenei* in lxiii. 13 and 91 (though even so late as the time of Schwabe's first edition, 1866, no one had seen that these readings were not original). Of the corrector of R, on the other hand, M thought so badly that, in the very large number of cases where R² and G² had the same variant, he felt that the alliance destroyed the value of G²'s opinion, and therefore as a rule did not adopt the latter's variant as the reading for his text. But, though so acute in detecting the changes made by G² in the text of G, he failed to see that R² had made many changes in the text of R, and thus was deceived into regularly following R²'s corrected readings where those of G differed.

This combination, even if the facts in detail agreed with it, is too fantastic for acceptance. But they do not.

M does not follow G²'s variant everywhere, e. g., in lxiii. 19, where the latter corrected *cedit* to *cedat*, and added *al' cedit* above. He did not, in fact, follow the variant *al' bis* (= *experibis*) in the one case, xxi. 6, that has any real weight to support the theory that M had the MS G before him as he wrote. He did not think badly of R²; for in several places, as in the case of

indignis, lxvi. 86, and *fratri*, lxviii. 91, he adopted R²'s variant in his text—and, further, he himself occasionally copied, as a variant, a variant by R³, as in the case of *al' ere citatis*, lxiii. 18. Further, the theory that M set a superstitiously high value upon the judgment of G² is made difficult to hold by the fact that, in the places where M's reading corresponds to G²'s variant, G² is obviously wrong, as in lxiv. 298, *gnatisque* OGR, *al' gratis* G², *gratisque* M. And the entire hypothesis that M gets some of his readings of this kind from G²'s variants is crippled by the fact that precisely the same combination of a blundering or wrong-headed reading and a variant giving the right reading of the tradition appears in M a number of times, as in xi. 7, *septem geminus* OGR, *septem geminis* M, *al' nus* M² (a perfect analogue for the *experibus* example), without a corresponding combination in G, and occurs 11 times after G² stops his work.

It is obvious that the opposite theory accounts vastly more easily for the state of affairs. M had gone astray in a number of places, and M² had generally corrected the error by giving the reading of the archetype R in the form of a variant above. G², when M came into his hands, finding so much that was good and new in it, and perhaps working provisionally and in a hurry, had too much confidence in the manuscript, and here and there added M's blundering reading to G in the form of a variant. His work was never completed (in the last quarter of G he neither wrote variants nor made corrections, except the hitherto unreported *Vltas* to *Multas* ci. 1, doubtless done when the paragraph marks were put in); and these foolish variants were in consequence never erased.

The acceptance of this theory will also explain certain corrections, which otherwise are puzzling. Thus:

xxiii. 19: *Quod cuius* OR, with *al' Quod culus* in the margin by R²; *Quod cuius* G, corrected to *Quod culus* by G², with *al' cuius* written above by G²; *Quod culus* M, with *al' cuius* written above by M².

xxviii. 14: *nobis* O; *nobis al' uobis* R and R²; *nobis* G, changed to *uobis* with *al' nobis* written above, by G²; *uobis* with *al' nobis* written above, M and M².

lxiv. 309: *uutte* OGRM (in M with a short first *t*, which could be taken for *c*); *uicte* G².

It has hitherto seemed strange that G^2 , instead of writing the corrected reading as a variant above the word in the two passages first mentioned, should have corrected the text and written the former reading above. But this procedure is at once intelligible if G^2 was correcting from M , who had here inverted the readings of R and R^2 . The same hypothesis explains the change in the third example.

I am at present forced, then, to think that G was corrected, not upon its archetype a , nor even upon its sister $MS R$, but upon M , one of the daughters of R . Further light may come with further study; but it seems improbable that the result will be changed. If it stands, then our critical editions will ultimately give the readings of OGR and R^2 alone, the work of G^2 having no value for the text. I regret the loss of this aid, in spite of the fact that everything of importance by G^2 is also found in the work of R or R^2 .

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ON SOME PASSAGES OF CATULLUS AND MARTIAL

By J. P. POSTGATE

I. CATULLUS lxvi. 75 ff.:

non his tam laetor rebus quam me afore semper
afore me a dominae uertice discrucior
quicum ego, dum uirgo quondam fuit, omnibus expers
unguentis, una milia multa bibi.
nunc uos, optato cum iunxit lumine taeda,
non prius unanimis corpora coniugibus
tradite nudantes reiecta ueste papillas
quam iucunda mihi munera libet onyx.

When a passage has provoked as much interpretation and emendation as the couplet 77-78 above, we may with certainty infer either that its difficulties are insoluble, in which case the prudent will leave it alone, or that their solution depends upon considerations that are likely to have eluded observation. Here fortunately the general thought is clear enough. The tress of Berenice's hair expresses its grief at being now separated from its mistress' head on which it had been drenched with precious ointments, and appeals to happily mated wives to remember it in their offerings on their nuptial night. The glaring absurdity of the conjunction of "*omnibus expers unguentis*" with "*una milia multa bibi*" has led to a crop of "emendations" which may be dismissed in the words of Professor Vahlen (*Hermes*, Vol. XV, p. 269) "*quae Lachmannus, quae Hauptius alique nouarunt praetereo quorum nihil est quod sua probabilitate placeat.*" The interpretations, in themselves, deserve as short a shrift. But they may be cited in part to bring out the points upon which attention must be centered. W. Johnson, Nake, and Mr. F. W. Cornish, the last English translator of Catullus, consider the text to mean "in whose company *I that now* am robbed of all unguents drank in many thousand unguents while she was yet a maid." For this, Latinity requires the insertion of *illa nunc* (*omnibus unguentis expers*). The current explanation may be illustrated from the

[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY III, July, 1908] 257

translations or paraphrases of Professor Vahlen, *loc. cit.*, "quicum ego, quae, dum quondam uirgo fuit illa" (higher up the page "dum uirgo fuit domina"), "omnibus expers eram, unguentis una (potione) milia multa bibi," and Professor Ellis "with whom I, as I was a stranger to all unguents while Berenice was in the former time of her virginity, so I have since drained in her company many thousands of oils." Mr. Ellis rightly says that "the construction is like Seneca *Epist.* 99. 16, "clarius cum audiuntur gemunt, et taciti quietique dum secretum est, cum aliquos uidere, in fletus novos excitantur," "in which *taciti—secretum est* is opposed as a period to *cum aliquos uidere, in fletus novos excitantur* just as *expers o. unguentis, dum uirgo quondam fuit* is opposed to *una milia multa bibi*." There is likeness between the two places. But unlikeness also, since in Seneca the statement is general, but here particular. And this difference is essential. It may be observed on both readings, first, that both require the insertion of *illa* to make Latinity; secondly that, though professedly taking *quondam* with *dum fuit*, they either ignore its force altogether or remove it outside its clause. This is indicated by Professor Vahlen's alternative paraphrase and by a variant proposed by Professor Ellis which, while keeping the same punctuation as before, he translates, "with whom in the old times while she was still a girl sprinkled (*expersa*) beyond all others with every kind of unguent, I absorbed many thousand essences." The truth is that, as the Seneca parallel shows, it is not required with *dum fuit*; and that, if inserted, then, just as *consule Pompeio quondam* in the epigram discussed below means "in the former consulship of Pompeius" as opposed to his present consulship, so these words should contrast Berenice's former virginity with her present virginity—an absurdity which interpretation has, at all costs, to avoid. But *quondam*, though superfluous and worse with *dum fuit*, is badly wanted with *expers*. And this the Latin should be punctuated to show:

quicum ego, dum uirgo quondam fuit omnibus expers
unguentis, una milia multa bibi

or, if three more commas are preferred,

quicum ego, dum uirgo, quondam, fuit, omnibus expers
unguentis, una milia multa bibi.

This order of words for "quondam, dum uirgo fuit, omnibus expers unguentis" is a hyperbaton which it is not difficult to parallel from Catullus: 44. 7 ff. "tussim, | non immerenti quam mihi meus uenter | dum sumptuosas appeto *dedit* cenas" also in a *dum* clause; and in this very poem 18 "*non ita me diui uera gemunt iuerint.*" The legitimacy of the collocation *quondam expers* requires no proof: but as an illustration we may take Lygdamus iii. l. 23 "*haec tibi uir quondam nunc frater, casta Neaera, | mittit.*"

Having, I trust, disproved the first alternative explanation of the inveterate disagreement of scholars about this passage, I will conclude with a word upon the second. Students of science in its various forms take a number of precautions to prevent their investigations being vitiated by the intrusion of their own persons or personalities: students of language and literature take next to none. Now in the personal equation of the modern scholar there is no more constant or more potent member than the notion that the construction of a sentence follows its order or that proximity of words involves connection of thoughts. So if *quondam* stands before *fuit*, with *fuit* will it be construed, whatever the clamor of sense or context. That here is the source of the mischief, we may confidently aver, when we note that a scholar who has paid particular attention to the prevalence of hyperbaton in Latin poets writes thus upon its character:

If anyone remarks on this that such an arrangement is contorted and unnatural, and wonders how the ancients, lacking our system of punctuation, could understand it at all, I shall cordially agree with him.¹

It may be doubted whether the writers from whom Professor Housman quotes would have acknowledged that their order was "contorted and unnatural" or have realized that a comprehension of their meaning is facilitated by this sort of thing—"fecit, ut ante, cauam, docui, spissescere nubem" Lucr. vi. 176. The modern system of punctuation, developed, it would appear, in part to mitigate the ambiguity which the absence or the inadequacy of inflexions entails upon a language, is frequently found of service by the reader who would escape from the obligation of grasping the sound and sense of a sentence as a whole. But the ancients neither required it for

¹Professor A. E. Housman, *Journal of Philology* XVIII, p. 6, where he gives a copious collection of hyperbata. I have had added some more in *A. J. P.* XVII, p. 41.

the former use nor desired it for the latter. They did not write for the eye of the skipper and the skimmer, but for the voice and the ear of people to whom the form and frame of the ancient sentence was a very part of their consciousness. And when so read we may be certain that there is not one of these "contorted" sentences which is not at once intelligible—and that one not least of all, which we have seen has been so long misunderstood.

I will add two examples where our modern habits of reading interfere with our appreciation of an ancient's meaning. In Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 628:

καὶ διαλλάττειν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνδράσιν Λακωνικοῖς

πρὸς has nothing to do with ἡμᾶς next to which it stands, but signifies "besides." And in Statius *Thebais* x. 827 ff.:

hactenus arma tubae ferrumque et uulnera; sed nunc
comminus astrigeros Capaneus tollendus in axes.
non mihi iam solito uatum de more canendum;
maior ab Aoniis poscenda amentia lucis. 830
mecum omnes audete deae! siue ille profunda
missus nocte furor Capaneaue signa secutae
arma Iouem contra Stygiae rapuere sorores
seu uirtus egressa modum seu gloria praeceps e. q. s.

Here *Capanea* goes primarily with *arma* rather than with *signa* which stands next to it, since the crucial point is why *Capaneus* fought against Iuppiter. And if it be not so taken, *rapuere arma* will have its proper sense of 'caught up arms' and the Eumenides will be said to do the fighting themselves.

II. CATULLUS cxiii:

Consule Pompeio quondam duo, Cinna, solebant
Meciliam. facto consule nunc iterum
manserunt duo, sed creuerunt milia in unum
singula. fecundum semen adulterio.

No one now doubts who is the subject of this epigram. It is Mucia, the daughter of Q. Mucius Scaeuola, and the third wife of Pompey, with whom, as Catullus hints here, Julius Caesar had an intrigue. Pleitner who made this discovery not unnaturally thought that her name in some form or other, should appear in the text, and he conjectured *Mucillam*, the diminutive adopted, e. g.,

by Schwabe, Baehrens,¹ Riese, and myself in the Corpus text. The obstacle to this change is that the manuscripts present another name, and that an actual one. For *Mecilia*(*m*) means *Maecilia*(*m*). Is it possible to resolve the difficulty without deserting the tradition? Let us see.

First, to deal with the alteration of the name. There is nothing more contumelious, nothing more characteristic of fashionable or aristocratic insolence² than to allude to a person by a soubriquet or a perversion of his proper name. This weapon Catullus did not scruple to use, as we know from the offensive nickname (*Mentula*) which he applied to his enemy Mamurra. It is therefore in keeping with what we know of him that he should miscall a lady belonging to the illustrious family of the Scaeuolae by an obscure and plebeian name. But why by this particular one? Shall we rest content with the explanation that it was the one most convenient to his verse? To contemporaries of Catullus and Pompey it would suggest another name, associated with one of the least creditable incidents of that statesman's career. *Maecilia* corresponds, syllable for syllable, to *Aemilia*, the name of his previous wife. The circumstances of her marriage to Pompey are thus given by his biographer Plutarch *Pomp.* 9 (tr. Long):

As Sulla admired Pompeius for his superior merit and thought that he would be a great support to his own interests, he was anxious in some way to attach him by family relations. Metella, the wife of Sulla, had also the same wish, and they persuaded Pompeius to put away Antistia and to take to wife Aemilia, the stepdaughter of Sulla, the child of Metella by Scæurus, who was living with her husband and was pregnant. This matter of the marriage was of a tyrannical character and more suited to the interests of Sulla than conformable to the character of Pompeius, for Aemilia, who was pregnant, was taken from another to be married to him, and Antistia was put away with dishonor and under lamentable circumstances, inasmuch as she had just lost her father also, and that too on her husband's account; for Antistius was murdered in the Senate-house because he was considered to be an adherent of Sulla for the sake of Pompeius; and the mother of Antistia having witnessed all this put an

¹ Baehrens (*Commentary*) thinks that it should be written *Moecillam*, "forma plebeia" which is no improvement.

² This may be illustrated by an anecdote from actual experience. A *στυγής* who expected to be first in his examination thus referred to a contemporary rival whom I will here call Fox. "Who else is there?" he said; "there's a man called Ox or Pox!"

end to her life, so that this misfortune was added to the tragedy of the marriage; and in sooth another besides, for Aemilia herself died immediately afterwards in childbirth in the house of Pompeius.¹

It seems then not improbable that in his selection of a name Catullus flings out at Pompey a taunt, the point of which a contemporary would easily comprehend, that he who had robbed another man of his wife was himself treated no better than he had thus deserved. $\delta \gamma \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma \tau \alpha \varsigma \alpha \lambda \lambda \omicron \tau \rho \iota \alpha \varsigma \epsilon \pi \omicron \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \tau \omicron \iota \sigma \iota \nu \epsilon \pi \lambda \acute{\eta} \gamma \eta \varsigma$ —Aristophanes *Ran.* 1049.

I pass now to what seems a distant topic—the variants for the proper name *Caecilianus* in certain codices of Martial. This word, as an appellation of fictitious persons satirized on different accounts, is the vulgate reading in fifteen epigrams. In two places² Cinna then is substantial manuscript support for another name, in i. 73 that of A^A (Lindsay's first class) and in ix. 70. 6, 10 that of B^A (his second class). This name is "*Maecilianus*." And we must first ask if it has any claim to have come from the hand of Martial himself. Schneidewin thought it had; for it stands in his text at i. 73. If it has, then *Caecilianus* must be an intruder in one or other of the poems cited. There is no reason why it should not be. In all the four places where *Caedicianus* is found, one or more of Schneidewin's codices give *Caecilianus* and the same is true of *Sextilianus* in x. 29. 6. More striking proof still that a wrong name may creep into our text of Martial may be gathered from the dissension of the MSS at vi. 88. Here A^A C^A give *Caecilianus*, but B^A *Sosibianus*; and it is certain that either the one or the other of these readings is an importation from other places where they occur—12 places, say, for *Caecilianus* and 3 for *Sosibianus*. A purely accidental confusion is quite out of the question.

There being thus sufficient evidence that a proper name in an epigram of Martial is liable to be assimilated to a name of similar scansion in other epigrams, it remains to consider whether this may have happened to *Maecilianus* and *Caecilianus*. The first name, to say the least, is incomparably the rarer; and the temptation to change it, when, moreover, the change was so slight, would be very considerable. And this would account for the fact that it

¹ Compare *Sulla* 33 and *Zonaras* 10. 1.

² I neglect iv. 15, as the attestation is doubtful. Lindsay's note is "*maeciliane* corr. cec. C^A ut uid. (in Comm. ad CAECILIANUM)."

is supported only by minorities among the MSS. We may infer, then, that the testimony of the MSS of Martial does not discountenance the presumption that *Maecilianus* was the original name in i. 73 or in ix. 70, or, it may be, in both.

The great influence which the writings of Catullus had upon his confessed admirer the epigrammatist is known to all the world, and I shall not be accused of rashness if I endeavor to trace a connection with a piece so notorious as the one before us. Martial i. 73 and Catullus cxiii resemble each other in more than one respect. The subject in both cases is a wife's infidelity, and it is treated in both cases with outspoken coarseness. This cannot count for very much; but what appears to be more significant is that in both cases the hint of the epigram is a prodigious increase in the lady's admirers. In Catullus the rise is from *duo* to *duo milia*; in Martial from *nemo gratis* to *ingens turba*. It would make the Martial epigram more biting if instead of a shadowy *Caecilianus* we had a *Maecilianus*, a "Maecilia-man" as we might say, whose measures to preserve his wife's fidelity were as unfortunate as those of the famous cuckold in Catullus.

The circumstances of ix. 70 are different, but they are simple enough if we have the Latin before us. Accordingly I will give the reading *Maecilianus* the same chance here which Schneidewin has given it in i. 73. I will place it in the context, and, with the shortest of paraphrases to show what, if accepted, it would mean, I will leave the question of merit to the unbiased judgment of the reader.

Dixerat 'o mores! o tempora!' Tullius olim
sacrilegum strueret cum Catilina nefas,
cum gener atque socer diris concurreret armis
maestaque civili caede maderet humus:
cur nunc 'o mores!' cur nunc 'o tempora!' dicis?
quod tibi non placeat, Maeciliane, quid est?
nulla ducum feritas, nulla est insania ferri;
pace frui certa laetitiaque licet.
non nostri faciunt tibi quod tua tempora sordent,
sed faciunt mores, Maeciliane, tui.

Cicero exclaimed on the morals of his times in the age of a Catiline and the conflicts of a Caesar and a Pompey. But why do you do so now, Maecilianus? It is not our times that are to blame. It is you whose morals are a Maecilian's.

THE PALM OF VICTORY

By F. B. TARBELL

No antique symbol is more familiar to us than the palm branch¹ carried in the hand in token of victory. Given to successful competitors in the athletic and other contests which abounded in the Greek and Roman world, it acquired, at least in metaphor, a universal significance and was one of the commonest attributes of the goddess Victory herself. References to it in the literature and representations of it in the art of the Roman imperial period are so numerous that it would be idle to attempt a list of them. It is enough to cite the dialogue of Plutarch which discusses the question why the palm was universally bestowed upon victors in the games.²

No ancient writer who speaks of the palm of victory suggests that the symbol was not of high antiquity, while Plutarch in two passages³ and Pausanias in one⁴ expressly connect it with the establishment of the Delian games by Theseus. Nevertheless it does not take much inquiry to discover that this symbol is conspicuously absent from the literature and the art of Greece down to about the end of the fifth century B. C.⁵ Various writers of this earlier time refer literally or figuratively to the crown of victory;⁶ Pindar and Bacchylides especially are constantly singing of the crown: but no one of these has a word to say of the

¹The word "branch," as here used, though scientifically incorrect, is well established in popular English.

²*Quaest. Conviv.* viii. 4, especially § 1: *τί δῆποτε τῶν ἀγώνων στέφανον ἄλλος ἄλλον ἔχει, τὸν δὲ φοινίκῃ πάντες.*

³*Theseus* 21. 3; *Quaest. Conviv.* viii. 4. 3.

⁴viii. 48. 3.

⁵The fact has been repeatedly remarked. In 1884 Kiessling in a note on Horace, *Odes* i. 1. 5 said: "Ausser dem Kranz . . . erhielt der Sieger, aber erst seitdem der Orient durch Alexander erschlossen, regelmässig einen Palmzweig." This puts the general adoption of the palm of victory too late. The earliest correct statement with which I am acquainted was made in 1893 by Milchhöfer, in *Archäologische Studien* H. Brunn dargebracht, p. 62. Some of the references given below to works of art are borrowed from Milchhöfer's note.

⁶Simon. 135; Herod. viii. 26; Soph. *Aj.* 465; Thuc. ii. 46; Eur. *I. T.* 12, and often. [CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY III, July, 1908] 264

palm.¹ On the monumental side the evidence is of the same tenor. From the period in question we neither possess nor hear of any statue, relief,² or picture of an athlete or of Victory with a palm branch. The full force of this negative evidence can be appreciated only after consideration of its abundance and its wide geographical distribution. The list of examples includes not only several athlete statues of which we know the motives and several statues of Victory,³ but a quantity of Attic vases and the extensive series of Elean and Sicilian coins with representations of Victory. If this negative evidence, literary and monumental, does not cover every nook and corner of the Greek world, it at least warrants us in saying that the palm as a symbol of victory was unknown at the four great national festivals, the Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia, and Nemea, at Athens, and probably at all the more important athletic centers.

Then, somewhere about 400 B. C., unheralded by any extant author, the palm of victory begins to make its appearance. Thus Eupompus of Sicyon, who flourished at about that date, painted a picture of a victor in some athletic contest—we are not told what or where—holding a palm branch.⁴ Somewhat later the painter Nicias represented Nemea, who personifies the Nemean games, with the same symbol.⁵ Of extant representations the earliest is probably that on a coin of Elis, struck about 400 B. C., where a palm is put in the hand of Victory.⁶ It is likely that this indicates a usage already coming in at Olympia. That the same usage existed at Athens from 387 B. C. onward is attested by at least six Panathenaic amphoras.⁷ By the time of Philip II the symbol had become familiar in Macedon, as witness the tetra-

¹ Frg. 75 of Pindar, in which Boeckh found the palm at Nemea (ll. 15, 16), owed this to improbable emendation of a corrupt text.

² Copies of Greek athlete statues having a support in the form of a palm trunk or having a palm branch sculptured on the support are not evidence, except for the late period in which the copies were executed. We have no reason for supposing that the relief at Tegea representing the hero Iasius with a palm in his right hand (Paus. viii. 48. 1) was an early work.

³ Bulle in Roscher *Lexikon der griech. u. röm. Mythologie*, s. v. "Nike," 334 ff.

⁴ Pliny *N. H.* xxxv. 75.

⁵ *Ibid.* 27, 28.

⁶ Gardner *Types of Greek Coins*, Pl. VIII, 4.

⁷ *Monumenti dell' Inst.* X, 48 e 1, 2; f 5; g 10, 11, 12.

drachms on whose reverse a boy rider is now crowning his horse and now carrying a palm.¹ Before the end of the fourth century it was established even in Campania, where a didrachm has on its reverse Victory attaching a wreath to a palm branch.² To about the same period one or two South Italian vases on which the symbol appears may belong.³

The evidence cited suffices to show that before the end of the fourth century the palm had become a generally accepted symbol of victory. Livy, writing of its introduction into Rome in 293 B. C., knows of it only as at that time a usual Greek symbol.⁴ The earliest extant reference to it in literature, so far as I have been able to discover, is by Chrysippus⁵ in the third century B. C. He speaks of it in the familiar way in which a writer of the fifth century speaks of the crown of victory.

The palm must have come into use at some one athletic center and spread from there over the rest of the Greek world. The suggestion of Robert,⁶ repeated by Bulle,⁷ that the starting-point was Nemea seems to be based upon nothing but the picture by Nicias of "Nemea palmigera" and perhaps the corrupt fragment of Pindar, referred to above (p. 265, n. 1). This suggestion may be summarily dismissed as without probability. Inasmuch as the palm tree was sacred to Apollo, we naturally think of the two great centers of Apolline worship, Delphi and Delos; and it is noteworthy that these are the only two places whose claims are advanced by speakers in the dialogue of Plutarch cited above (p. 264). But from words which Plutarch puts into the mouth of one of his speakers⁸ it appears that the claim of Delphi was not supported by legend, whereas there was a current story

¹ Head *Historia Numorum*, p. 197.

² Head *op. cit.*, p. 28.

³ *Compte rendu de St. Pétersbourg*, 1862, Pl. VI; Millin *Peintures de vases antiques* I, Pl. 24(?); *Gazette arch.*, 1879, p. 32(?).

⁴ Livy 10, 47: palmaeque tum primum, translato e Graecia more, victoribus datae.

⁵ Quoted by Plutarch, *De Stoicorum repugnantiis*, § 23 (1045 D): πότερον ἔξεστι τὸν βραβεύτην τὸν φοίνικα, ὁποτέρῳ βούλεται, ἀποδιδόναι;

⁶ Preller-Robert *Griech. Mythologie* I, 495, n. 4.

⁷ Roscher *Lexikon d. griech. u. röm. Mythologie* II, 331.

⁸ "ἀλλὰ ταῦτά γ' ἐπεν "οὐχ ἱστορίας οὐδὲ περιγηγητικῶν δῶδε βιβλίων κ. τ. λ.;" *Quaest. Conv.* viii. 4. 5.

according to which the palm was first given by Theseus in instituting the Delian games. Now the Delian games, which had become extinct or nearly so, were revived and reorganized by the Athenians in 426.¹ Does not this suggest a plausible hypothesis? The Athenians, we may conjecture, either at the first celebration of the new quadrennial festival or not long thereafter, bestowed palms upon the victors in the games. In so doing they may possibly have been reviving an ancient local custom, but more probably they were introducing a novelty. From Delos the practice spread to other places till it became universal. On such a basis of fact the legend about Theseus would naturally spring up.

The only point that remains obscure is the reason for the popularity of the new symbol. On this I cannot shed much light. It must be remembered that neither on the island of Delos nor elsewhere did the palm supplant the crown; rather it was a supplement to the crown. The matter would be more intelligible, if we could find two different occasions subsequent to a victory, at one of which the palm was bestowed, and the crown at the other. But any one who has examined the evidence marshaled by Petersen in *Die Kunst des Pheidias*, pp. 43, 44, must be convinced that the crown, or at any rate a crown, was presented immediately after the conclusion of the contest. It seems almost certain that the palm was given at the same time. This is a probable inference from a relief which shows an athlete with both crown and palm,² and is pretty plainly implied by Vitruvius when he speaks of the victors at the four great Greek festivals as *in conventu stantes cum palma et corona*.³ If this is right, it cannot be urged that the palm filled a long felt want by supplying a ceremonial to an occasion previously left bare. But a practice which began at one center so important as Delos might be imitated elsewhere from a desire not to do less than was done at Delos in the way of celebration. Moreover, palm branches have the great advantage over most crowns of being much less perishable. The natural tendency to imitation, reinforced by the advantage of having in the palm branch a symbol of victory more

¹ Thuc. iii. 104. 2, 6.

² IX Praef.

³ Arch. Zeitung, 1861, Pl. CLIII.

enduring than the traditional crown, may account sufficiently for the spread of the new custom.

Although in popular estimation the palm came to be of at least equal importance with the crown, it does not seem to have been officially so regarded. To the end there were *ἀγῶνες στεφανύται*, but we never hear of *ἀγῶνες φοινικῖται*.

Thus far we have had in view the palm branch carried in the hand. But some modern books¹ of reference speak also of the palm as used for crowns of victory. This is based solely upon a passage of Pausanias (viii. 48), which has been previously referred to and must now be quoted in full. The received text is as follows:

ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ἐτέρᾳ στήλῃ πεποιημένος ἐστὶν Ἰάσιος, ἵππου τε ἐχόμενος καὶ κλάδον ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ φέρων φοίνικος· νικῆσαι δὲ ἵππῳ φασὶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τὸν Ἰάσιον, ὅτε Ἡρακλῆς ἔθετο ὁ Θηβαῖος τὰ Ὀλύμπια. Ἐν μὲν δὴ Ὀλυμπίᾳ κοτίνου τῷ νικῶντι δίδοσθαι στέφανον καὶ ἐν Δελφοῖς δάφνης, τοῦ μὲν ἤδη τὴν αἰτίαν ἀπέδωκα ἐν τοῖς ἐς Ἡλείους, τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα δηλώσω· ἐν Ἰσθμῷ δὲ ἡ πίτυς καὶ ἐν Νεμέᾳ τὰ σέλινα ἐπὶ τοῦ Παλαίμονος καὶ τοῦ Ἀρχεμόρου τοῖς παθήμασιν ἐνομίσθησαν. οἱ δὲ ἀγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον· ἐς δὲ τὴν δεξιάν ἐστι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἐστιθέμενος φοῖνιξ, ἐνομίσθη δὲ ἐπὶ τοιῷδε· Θησείᾳ ἀνακομιζόμενον ἐκ Κρήτης φασὶν ἐν Δῆλῳ ἀγῶνα ποιήσασθαι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, στεφανοῦν δὲ αὐτὸν τοὺς νικῶντας τῷ φοίνικι.

The logic of this passage is confused, but Frazer is the only editor who seems to have questioned the soundness of the text. His note reads: "ἐς δὲ τὴν δεξιάν ἐστι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἐστιθέμενος φοῖνιξ. These words have the appearance of being interpolated. The present participle is particularly strange." The remedy here proposed is worse than the disease, for the omission of the sentence quoted throws the explanatory remarks of Pausanias out of connection with the sculptured relief which occasions them. As for the present participle, *ἔστιν ἐστιθέμενος* is unobjectionable for *ἐστίθεται*. The trouble, if trouble there be, must lie elsewhere, and to me it seems probable that the word *φοίνικος*, or, better, the whole sentence, *οἱ δὲ ἀγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον*, should be expunged as a gloss. In supporting this suggestion I do not lay stress chiefly on the gain in logical

¹ E. g., Liddell & Scott *Greek-English Lexicon*, s. v. φοῖνιξ; Daremberg et Saglio *Dictionnaire des antiquités* I, p. 1530; Hehn *Culturpflanzen* (7th ed., 1902), p. 269.

coherence which is secured by the change. The main objections to the impugned sentence are that it is not true and that, if it is not true, Pausanias could hardly have believed it true.

I say, it is not true that the crown at most contests in Pausanias' time was made of palm. To be sure, literary information on this subject, apart from the four great festivals, is scanty. From Pindar and the scholia to Pindar we learn that a myrtle crown was bestowed at the Epidaurian Asclepieia,¹ the Megarian games of Alcathous,² the Argive Heraea,³ and the festival of the sons of Heracles at Thebes.⁴ At the Athenian Panathenaea the crown was of olive;⁵ at the Neapolitan Augustalia, of ears of wheat for men, of something else (laurel?) for boys;⁶ at the Capitolia in Rome, of oak;⁷ at the agon Albanus, of olive, not natural, but wrought of gold.⁸

Another source of information as to the materials of agonistic crowns is afforded by the sculptured representations of such crowns⁹ on marble pedestals, etc. It is evident that the sculp-

¹Pind. *Isth.* vii. 147-50. In an inscription from Priene (*Inscripfen von Priene*, 268 b, c) a crown worn at this festival is said to be of θαλλός. This does not imply a change after Pindar's time. στέφανος θαλλοῦ is a crown of leaves, θαλλός not being specific.

²Pind. *Isth.* vii. 147-50.

³Schol. Pind. *Ol.* vii. 152.

⁴Pind. *Isth.* iii. 117, with the scholium.

⁵Schol. Plato *Parmen.* 127 A and other late authorities cited by Michaelis *Der Parthenon*, p. 318.

⁶Stat. *Silv.* v. 3. 226: Chalcidicae Cerealia dona coronae; *Inscripfen von Olympia* 56. 15-17: τιμαὶ [δὲ κ]ατὰ [τ]ὴν Καίσαρος ἐπιταγὴν τοῖς μὲν παῖσιν . . . υἱὸς στέφανος, τοῖς δὲ ἀνδράσι σταχέινος. In *IG XIV.* 748 we have on a stone at Naples a sculptured representation of a crown won by a boy at these games. If we could trust the statement of Franz (*CIG* 5805) that this crown is of laurel, we should be able to supply the lacuna in the inscription of Olympia. The Neapolitan stone ought to be re-examined with reference to this point.

⁷Juv. vi. 387 and other passages quoted by Wissowa in Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. "Capitolia." Inasmuch as these passages refer to the contest in poetry, it is interesting to be assured by an inscription (*Inscripfen von Magnesia* 181. 5, 6) that the athletic prize at these games was the same.

⁸Stat. *Silv.* iii. 5. 28, 29; iv. 2. 65-67; v. 3. 227-31; Mart. ix. 23. 1-4. The prize is clearly shown by several of these passages to have been a crown, and not a mere branch, as it is called by P. J. Meier in Pauly-Wissowa I, p. 867.

⁹On this subject Dr. G. B. Hussey's careful paper on "Greek Sculptured Crowns and Crown Inscriptions," *Am. Journal of Archaeology*, 1890, pp. 69 ff. (= *Papers of the Am. School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Vol. V, pp. 135 ff.) has been of great assistance.

tured crowns were intended to conform in appearance to the actual crowns; but unfortunately the workmanship is often so careless that a determination of the kind of leaves intended is impossible. The printed comments in most cases do not attempt this. Probably an examination of the originals would often enable one to decide at least whether palm leaflets were intended or not; but I am obliged to restrict myself to cases where an apparently trustworthy report, pictorial or verbal, exists. The number of monuments thus available¹ is not large, but they yield information in regard to the crowns given at something like thirty-five festivals, besides those known from the literary sources quoted above. In regard to all of these it is probably safe to say that the crowns were not of palm.²

A few additional facts of the same sort may be gleaned from coins of the Roman imperial period, on which are represented crowns with names of festivals.³ Of the five cases that I have noted none looks at all as if made of palm leaflets, unless it be the crown of the Actian games shown on several coins of Nicopolis and called by Professor Percy Gardner in the *British Museum Catalogue* a crown of reeds. This Actian crown was above judged not to be of palm on the evidence of *IG XIV. 739*.

Finally we may bring in the rare cases of statues of athletes

¹ *CIA II. 1217* (of the Delian crown on which Dr. B. H. Hill has kindly sent me a rubbing), 1319 (= 'Εφηνεπς' *Αρχ.*, 1841, No. 915), 1367 (= 'Εφηνεπς' *Αρχ.* 1862, Pl. 34); *IG XIV. 738* (= *Annali dell' Inst.*, 1865, p. 97), 739 (= *Annali dell' Inst.*, 1865, Pl. G); *IG IX. 138*; *Inscriptionen von Olympia* 188. This list is doubtless incomplete. It includes some crowns bestowed for literary and musical victories, but the distinction between these and gymnastic victories is irrelevant for the present purpose.

² In most of these cases it is not prudent to be more specific. But the crown given at the Athenian Lenaea was certainly of ivy (*CIA II. 1367*), as would be expected; and on the evidence of Pittakis' illustration ('Εφ. 'Αρχ., No. 915), coupled with antecedent probability, it is pretty safe to say that the crown given at the Dodonaean Naia was of oak, though Pittakis calls it vine. The indeterminate Delian crown on *CIA II. 1217* is at least not inconsistent with the theory that the crown at the Delia was of laurel—a theory altogether likely in view of the fact that the complimentary crown conferred by the Delians was regularly of laurel (δάφνης στέφανος ὁ λεγόμενος or ὁ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ; *Bull. de corr. hell.*, 1904, pp. 122 ff. and 271 ff., etc.). Cf. the similar formulas at Delphi (Dittenberger *Sylloge*² 215. 8; 291. 12; 662. 8), where the crown of victory was also of laurel.

³ Cohen *Médailles impériales I*, Néron, Nos. 46 ff.; *Brit. Mus. Catalogue of Coins, Thessaly to Aetolia*, Pl. XIX. 8; *Lydia*, Pl. XX. 13 and p. 202; *Galatia, etc.*, Pls. XXXIV. 12, and XXXV. 7.

wearing crowns, although the victories thus commemorated cannot now be connected with particular festivals. I have in mind the Rampin head,¹ which has a crown of oak leaves, the bronze head from Beneventum² and a marble head in Dresden,³ both with crowns of olive, and the boxer from Sorrento,⁴ whose crown is at any rate not of palm.

Thus from one source and another we get evidence that at approximately fifty festivals, including the four of traditionally highest importance, the crowns of victory were not made of palm, and for no festival do we get evidence that the crown was of palm. Fifty, to be sure, do not constitute a majority of the multitudinous festivals which Pausanias may have had in mind. But it is scarcely possible that the unknown were very different from the known. Indeed it would not be very rash to say that the palm, almost never used for crowns of any kind,⁵ was seldom or never used for crowns of victory.

Now if the statement conveyed in the words οἱ δὲ ἀγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον is not true, it is not likely that Pausanias could have believed it true. Is it not then reasonable to delete these words as an interpolation into the text? The improvement secured thereby to the logic of the passage may be allowed to count for something in recommending the change. But if we are willing to go so far, we shall be strongly tempted to go a step farther. στεφανοῦν, near the end of the quotation given above (p. 268), implies a version of the legend inconsistent with that of Plutarch, who thinks of Theseus as bestowing a palm branch in token of victory.⁶ Such a difference of version is not in itself sufficient to justify an attack upon the text; but here the word στεφανοῦν, only half appropriate to the traditional text, is quite inappropriate to the text as emended. I suggest, therefore,

¹ Reinach *Recueil de têtes antiques*, Pls. III, IV.

² *Fondation Piot, Monuments et mémoires* I, Pls. X, XI.

³ *Jahrb. d. Inst., Anzeiger*, 1894, p. 172.

⁴ Kalkmann *Proportionen des Gesichts*, Pl. III.

⁵ Wreaths of palm were worn by the leaders of choruses at the Spartan Gymnopædia (Athenaeus 678 b). I know of no other case.

⁶ *Theseus* 21. 3: καὶ τοῖς νικῶσι τότε πρῶτον ὑπ' ἐκείνου φοίνικα δοθῆναι. Cf. *Quest. Conviv.* viii. 4. 3.

that what Pausanias wrote was some such word as *κοσμήσαι*, and that *στεφανοῦν*, a mistaken gloss, crept into the text to the dislodgment of the genuine word.

My theory of the matter is that the change from *κοσμήσαι*(?) to *στεφανοῦν* was the starting-point of the corruption of the text, and that this blunder led subsequently to the interpolation of the sentence, *οἱ δὲ ἀγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον*.

If these suggestions do not carry conviction, then we must take the view that Pausanias not only wrote a muddled passage, but also on an important point misrepresented the facts. In any case the statement that the palm was commonly used for crowns of victory ought to disappear from our books of reference.

THE MSS OF THE HISTORIA AUGUSTA

BY SUSAN H. BALLOU

A fresh illustration of the disadvantage under which text-criticism of the so-called *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* labors in not having as a basis an accurate report of the Palatine MS, now that it is recognized as the only early source for the text, appears in a recent article by Rühl in *Rh. Mus.* LXII (1907), p. 1, in a note on *Commodus* 14. 1. Peter reports there the reading: *cum fruges et non deessent* in PB, and suggests *fortasse: tum non*, though in the text he merely omits *et*. Baehrens proposed *etiam* as an emendation for *et*, and Petschenig ingeniously changed *et non deessent* to *emendae essent*. Rühl now offers *fruges et oleum non d.* In point of fact the troublesome *et* does not occur at all in P, but only in B, which alone is not sufficient authority. This is only one of many false reports by Peter (Jordan-Eyssenhardt have here the correct report), which have given rise to similar waste of time and ingenuity on the part of scholars in emending readings which do not exist. A number of other examples might be cited, e. g., *Avid. Cass.* 14. 3: P and B read: *dum clemens dici cupit*, and in 14. 5, *de clementes* (*clementiis* P^a). In his apparatus Peter's report: "*clementes* PB," etc., including the reading of M, applies to 14. 5, and the conjectures of Salmasius and Petschenig, which he quotes, apply to 14. 3; but Peter, having failed to prefix the numbers of the lines, confuses the two reports, as does also Petschenig, who proceeds to emend the supposedly unreadable place in 14. 3 to *clementem se dici cupit*. This Peter then adopts in his text; whereas, emendation was unnecessary for 14. 3, and quite obvious and easy in 14. 5.

Again, *Heliog.* 14. 8, Peter reads in the text *et* before *sacramenti*—absence of italics implies its presence in PB. Vielhaber, feeling that a word must have fallen out, suggests three possible ways of filling the gap. In reality *et* occurs in neither MS. Also, *Opil. Macr.* 14. 3, both Peter and Jordan-Eyssenhardt report

ex translati in PB (and Peter adds *ex Graeco* in M). Peiper emends *ex* to *exinde*, adding that *ex Graeco* does not fit the sense, and "glücklicher Weise entbehren die HSS dieses Zusatzes." Unfortunately, however, *Graeco* does occur after *ex* in both P and B. In still another case, in *Ant. Pius* 5. 1, P's *cum aduixit* // is emended by Vielhaber to *quoad vixit*, which already exists in P in a correction by P³, which was not reported by Peter.

To prevent such misapprehensions as these, the need seems obvious of a revised critical apparatus, such as may serve as an accurate basis for future text-criticism. Lessing's newly completed *Lexicon Scriptorum Historiae Augustae* will indeed be of much service in avoiding errors of this kind, since Lessing made use of Dessau's new collation of P. For example, he has the correct reading at *Avid. Cass.* 14. 3. His work, however, does not attempt to be exhaustive in giving examples, but is rather illustrative, and in only this one of the above-cited cases would the new lexicon have been of service in correcting the error. And even though, as pointed out by Mommsen (*Hermes* XXV. 228 ff.), the text itself will not be greatly altered by a new report of P (it happens that in three of the above cases it would be), there should be at hand an exact report of the actual condition of P, together with all its corrections and additions, but simplified and cleared of all superfluous and confusing reports of B, except where they assist us in arriving at the original writing in the case of changes in P, or even where its correctors offer anything of value for the text. Furthermore, the matter of correctors' hands in P is one of considerable importance and has never had adequate treatment. Their respective contributions to the history of the text emendation of the *Historia Augusta* come to be of special interest and value if the most numerous and important can be identified as the work of the great pioneer humanist, Petrarch.

This question also is touched on in the above-mentioned article of Rühl, when in a comment on *Gord.* iii. 27. 10, he states that the corrections in P, *praetori totius urbis* and *tutori reip.* (of which Peter ascribes the first to P³, the second by implication to P²), are "Conjecturen Petrarcae." Only the first of the corrections is really involved, for the second, being by erasure, offers no evidence

as to hand. This identification of Peter's P¹ with Petrarch has indeed been made by De Nohac (*Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, 1st ed., p. 255), as far as concerns a large number of marginal notes and comments and in a very general way some correction of the text ("quelquesunes, 1st ed.; plusieurs, 2d ed.—dés corrections du Palat. lui appartiennent aussi"), but no details in illustration of the latter are given by him and there is certainly no ground for believing that he intends this remark to apply so widely to Peter's P¹ as Rühl attributes to him in a review of the first edition of De Nohac's book (*Berl. Wochenschr.*, 1893, p. 52). He must have been quoting from memory when he represents him as saying, "dass er (Petrarch) es war, der die nötige Umstellung in den *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* angab, s. 255." If De Nohac had meant this he would hardly have referred to the author of the marginal notes involved as "un lecteur du XIV^e siècle" (1st ed., p. 254), and two lines farther on as, "cet anonyme." Certainly Dessau (in *Hermes* XXIX. 402-5) does not understand De Nohac to have said that. My own belief in regard to the identification of Petrarch with this "anonyme" of the fourteenth century, and the extent to which he coincides with Peter's P¹, I hope soon to show in connection with a complete discussion of P's correctors and their significance for the question of the value of the minor MSS.

How complicated in general the matter of the correctors' hands is in P and how difficult it is, without a full and exhaustive study of them throughout the whole extent of the codex, to assign definitely their respective contributions to the true source, appears from a mere glance at the collation of the first twenty pages of the life of Alex. Sev., made for Mommsen by his correspondent in Rome and published in *Hermes* XXV. 282 ff. Within this short portion 17 changes in the body of the text are marked P^{em}, that is, of uncertain authorship. Of these 4 are concerned with erasures, where there is no evidence as to hand (though that fact is stated in regard to one only). Of the rest, 7 are by P² and 6 are by P³. The marginal note at 247. 1 (Peter's ed. of 1886, Vol. I) is also by P², as is perhaps to be inferred from the remark. Of the changes attributed to P², 5 are by P²; of those attributed to

P³, 1 is by P², and 1 is by P^b; and 1 other assigned to P^b belongs to P². Besides these points in the identification of the corrector—for the sake of completeness—the following inaccuracies in the report should be corrected:

248. 3: *ciuiaseuerat* P^a; *ciui^{li}aseuerat* (i. e. *ciuil^{li}a seuerat*; so B) P^b; *ciui^{ha}aseuerat* (i. e. *ciuil^{ha}a aseuerat*, so about half of the minor MSS) P²; 26: *tam* P^a *qam^v* (*t* is still legible under *q*) P^b.

249. 24: *cenuiui* P¹ B; *conuiui^a* P³.

251. 25: *contaminator* PB^b; *contra(atra)minator* B^a.

253. 21: *luxurie* P¹B; *luxuria* P² (the only erasure is of *e* to make place for *a*).

256. 17: *purpureae* (*purpuree* B) *colores* P¹B; *purpurei/* (*i* in eras.) P²; *coloris* (by eras.) P^{em}.

258. 10: *rei p̄* P¹B; *re/ p̄* (by eras.) P^{em}.

259. 25: *septimⁱinus* PB (*sep* in eras., but by the first hand, leaving a space of one letter before *t*—much blurred but legible).

267. 4: *seruisingenuis* P^a; *seruisingenuis* B^a; *serui ingenuis* P^{em}B^{em} (eras. only in both cases, probably by P^bB^b).

These corrections which I suggest serve for the most part merely to add weight to the evidence sought, namely that B is an early copy of P. But the bit of collation, while accurate enough to prove the point, is far from being so trustworthy as it would have been if made on the basis of a thorough acquaintance with the MS as a whole.

Having devoted much time and labor to making a complete and, I trust, accurate collation of P and B, together with a more or less thorough examination of all of the minor MSS to which I could get access—including especially the very interesting and valuable copy which, as DeNolhac shows, was made for Petrarch, viz., Paris 5816, which was not examined by Peter and has never been fully reported—I hope in the near future to publish a full and accurate report of P, together with such information in regard

to the minor MSS and their relation to P as shall settle several now open questions concerning their value for the text.¹

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹In making this announcement I am of course not unaware that a collation of the two oldest MSS has already been made by the learned scholar of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, H. Dessau, partial results of which were published by him in *Hermes* XIX, 393 ff. But there being no immediate prospect of the appearance of the long-expected edition from his hand, I have felt at liberty to put out at least such a basis for a new critical apparatus as can be obtained from the MSS, and as, it seems to me, is imperatively and immediately needed. For to an inquiry on the part of my former teacher and present colleague, Professor F. F. Abbott, of The University of Chicago, by whom my study of this collection was first inspired, Dessau most generously responded in a letter of November 11, 1902, as follows:

"Ich habe allerdings im Winter 1892/3 die beiden ältesten Handschriften der *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* mit der Absicht verglichen, einmal eine Ausgabe dieser Schriftsteller zu veranstalten. Ich bin aber im Folge vieler anderer Beschäftigungen bis jetzt nicht dazu gekommen, und glaube auch nicht dass ich in den nächsten Jahren dazu kommen werde. Unter diesen Umständen wäre es durchaus unzulässig, wenn ich gegen die Herausgabe der *Scriptores* durch irgend einen anderen Einspruch erheben wollte. Im Gegentheil ich begrüsse Ihren Entschluss die Biographien der Kaiser Tacitus und Probus herauszugeben oder durch einen Ihrer Schüler bearbeiten zu lassen, mit Freuden, und bitte Sie, sich dabei nicht zu kümmern um das was ich hätte schreiben können oder etwa noch schreiben werde, sondern nur um das was ich geschrieben habe."

THE *TABULA VALERIA* AND THE *TABULA SESTIA*

BY CHARLES J. O'CONNOR

There are two passages in Cicero in which he speaks of a certain *tabula Valeria* as if it were a definite object or spot in the Forum. In a third passage he speaks of a *tabula Sestia* in the same definite way. The nature and location of these two *tabulae* have been the subject of considerable discussion on the part of commentators and archaeologists. Platner, in *Am. Jour. Phil.* XIX (1898), p. 406, has discussed the current theories, but, it seems to me, has not solved the riddle. The most recent works on the topography of Rome give the traditional account. I wish to offer a new interpretation of the passages involved.

While Cicero was an exile he wrote (*Ad fam.* 14. 2. 2) from Thessalonica under date of October 5, 58 B. C. to Terentia and his children, bemoaning their wretched lot and his own lack of courage, and said: "Publius Valerius, most dutiful man, has written me—a thing which I read with many tears—how you were conducted from the house of Vesta to the *tabula Valeria*. Alas . . . to think that you are thus harassed, thus humbled in tears and mourning." The Latin runs:

Pisonem nostrum merito eius amo plurimum. eum ut potui per litteras cohortatus sum gratiasque egi ut debui. in novis tribunis pl. intellego spem te habere. id erit firmum si Pompeii voluntas erit sed Crassum tamen metuo. a te quidem omnia fieri fortissime et amantissime video nec miror sed maereo casum eius modi ut tantis tuis miseriis meae miseriae subleventur. nam ad me P. Valerius homo officiosus scripsit id quod ego maximo cum fletu legi quem ad modum a Vestae ad tabulam Valeriam ducta esses.

In his speech against Vatinius (9. 21) Cicero addressed Vatinius with these words: "I wish you to answer me whether, when you were leading Marcus Bibulus, the consul, . . . to prison, and your colleagues (that is the tribunes) from the *tabula Valeria* were bidding you to let him go, you made a bridge in front of the Rostra by putting together tribunals, over which a consul of the

Roman people . . . was led away not merely to prison, but to punishment and death"—*et a tabula Valeria collegae tui mitti iuberent.*

There have been two explanations of the phrase *tabula Valeria*, and each of them has continued to find acceptance because a chance resemblance has led scholars to seek a connection which does not exist. One view is that the words mean the bank of Valerius, which is suggested by a passage in Cicero (*Pro Quintio* 6. 25) where a *tabula Sestia* is mentioned. In this latter place the phrase is understood by some to mean a banker's office. Platner, in the article cited, has shown that such a connection is illogical. I hope to show in the second part of this paper what the real relation is.

The advocates of the other view seek to identify the *tabula Valeria* with a painting of some sort upon the wall of the old senate house. This idea was put in circulation by the scholiast who commented on the *In Vatinius* passage, saying that this was the *tabula* wherein Valerius Maximus displayed before the people his exploits in Gaul. This was doubtless suggested by the passage in Pliny (*N. H.* 35 [7]. 22) where it is said that the esteem in which painting was held at Rome was increased by Manius Valerius Maximus Messala, who in 264 B. C. had a picture of the battle in which he overcame the Carthaginians and Hiero in Sicily placed upon the side of the Curia Hostilia. The scholiast made a slip in saying *in Gallia* for *in Sicilia*. There are various statements in the Latin writers which indicate that the *tabula Valeria* of the *In Vatinius* passage and the painting mentioned by Pliny were in the same part of the Forum, but that is all that can be said in favor of the second view. What name, if any, was applied to the picture, we do not know. It was as likely to get its name from the scene represented as from the man who set it up. Platner shows that the picture or a copy of it or at least the name might have existed in the time of Cicero, and to his argument it can be added that if this picture was a *tabula picta* in the strict sense of that phrase it could be readily taken down from one wall and set up on another. But its existence in the time of Cicero is immaterial in the present discussion, for I think that the *tabula* was a bronze

tablet or set of tablets on which was engraved a law or series of laws; that the station or tribunal of the tribunes was near this so that they could consult the law when transacting business; that the phrase was equivalent—in some cases at least—to the tribunal of the tribunes. Manutius, according to Tyrrell (*Ad fam.* 14. 2), thought that this designated a sort of tribune's court, but he took the name as referring to the picture on the wall of the senate house.

A study of our two passages will lead us by different roads to the same spot—the station of the tribunes. Our way will be easier to follow if we keep in mind one fact which is characteristic of Cicero's writings and of his speeches especially. He is ever quick to point an argument, to embellish a period, by reference to the men and monuments of his own and past generations, especially when he is trying to prop up the crumbling institutions of the republic. He mentions by the names of their builders monuments which others refer to in general terms. We have an instance of this in the speech against Vatinius. The orator is speaking of the events of the year 59 B. C., of the rioting which attended the passage of the agrarian laws. Bibulus and Caesar were consuls that year. The former was one of the chief opponents of Pompey and Caesar. Vatinius was a tribune, an adherent of Pompey and Caesar, and was so aggressive that those tribunes whose sympathies were with the optimates were helpless. The passage in question can be understood best when studied in connection with one from Dio Cassius (38. 6) and one from Appian (*B. C.* 2. 11). From these we learn that, during the incident to which Cicero refers, Vatinius, a tribune, disregarding the protests of his colleagues laid violent hands on the consul and dragged him down from the Rostra and, when the other tribunes interfered, broke their fasces and even wounded some of these hitherto sacred magistrates. This unprecedented (according to Cicero) usurpation of power on the part of a tribune and this disregard of the sanctity of the tribune's body Cicero is bringing home to Vatinius, and he emphasizes it by reference to the *tabula Valeria*, that is, the law proposed by a member of the Valerian gens and ever after guarded by men of that clan.

Family pride often led one family or one gens to carry on some special kind of work for the public good through a number of generations. At times, for instance, it would be the construction and restoration of a public building, like the Basilica Aemilia, which was so well cared for by one family that it came to be called *Aemilia monumenta*. According to the history which was believed in Cicero's time, although it may not be today, the Valerian gens had secured and guarded a series of enactments pertaining to the rights of the plebeians and to their tribunes, the best known, if not the most important, being that which imposed the death penalty for violence done to a tribune. Although this set of laws is generally known as the Horatian, or Valerio-Horatian, law, it is more fitly called the Valerian. By referring to these venerable documents, within the shadow of which the colleagues of Vatinius stood on that eventful day, Cicero added force to his charge that Vatinius had usurped authority, whereas there is no point whatever in referring to the picture on the wall of the senate house or to a banker's office.

As for the letter to Terentia and the conjecture that she was compelled by Clodius to go to a banker in order to transact some business or make some declaration in connection with her husband's property, there seems to be very little to support such an idea. Business of this sort probably would have been transacted before a magistrate, not a banker, and moreover, Terentia could not have been forced to leave the protection of the Vestal Virgins. Publius Valerius is called *homo officiosus* perhaps because he has written to Cicero about the matter, but more probably because he conducted Terentia to the magistrate. If she had been compelled to go by Clodius, Cicero would never have used so mild a word as *ducta esses*. Then, too, it was not the mere fact that she went to the tribunal which disturbed Cicero but the manner of her going, as the phrase *quem ad modum* indicates. In going from the Atrium of Vesta to the tribunal she would have gone for some distance through the Forum at a time when there were many men there. The tribunal was probably out of doors so that Terentia would have been exposed the whole time to the insults of the ruffians who were in the service of Clodius. While it is true that in this letter (14.

2. 3) Cicero writes about the recovery of his own property and begs his wife not to sell any of hers and again a few weeks later (*Ad fam.* 14. 1. 5) urges her to spare her property, in both letters this seems to be a matter entirely distinct from the transaction at the *tabula Valeria*. The purpose of Terentia's visit, I take it, was to make some deposition or to observe some legal form which was necessary in securing the recall of Cicero. The mention of her humiliation comes in the midst of hopes and fears concerning the measures adopted by Cicero's friends for his relief. He says: "Piso is very deserving of my love. I have encouraged him as well as I could through letters, I have thanked him as was fitting. I understand that you put your hope in the new tribunes. It will be all right if Pompey's good will endures, but I fear Crassus. I see that you have done everything bravely and lovingly, and I do not wonder; yet I grieve that your lot is such that my wretchedness is relieved by yours," and then speaks of the visit to the *tabula Valeria*. It seems as if Terentia had told of her visit but not of the insults which she suffered during it.

In the letters of this period the exile harps upon the same subject, the attempts of the tribunes who were favorable to him to bring about his recall and the opposition of the Clodian faction. In the year 59, between Oct. 25 and Dec. 10, he writes to Quintus expressing confidence in the outcome of the struggle and the belief that the tribunes elect are his friends (*Ad Q. fr.* 1. 2. 16). On July 17, 58 he writes to Atticus that it is vain to depend on the election if Clodius is a tribune and Metellus, the consul elect, is hostile (*Ad Att.* 3. 12). Aug. 5 he writes to Atticus that his hope is in the tribunes elect (*Ad Att.* 3. 13). In another letter (*Ad Q. fr.* 1. 4) he names several tribunes whom he considers friendly. Aug. 17, 58 he asks Atticus how his recall can be brought about through the people unless all of the tribunes agree to it (*Ad Att.* 3. 15. 6). To Terentia, Nov. 25, he says that they need not despair if all the tribunes are on his side and if Lentulus, Pompey, and Caesar are as zealous as they seem (*Ad fam.* 14. 1). Nov. 29 he criticizes a bill introduced by the tribunes (*Ad Att.* 3. 23). In another letter to Atticus (3. 24) written Dec. 10 he is anxious, fearing that the tribunes have been alienated. Jan. 1, 57 a bill

for his recall was introduced in the senate but was vetoed by a tribune. Later in the same year one of the tribunes who was friendly to him was attacked and nearly killed by members of the Clodian faction while performing his duty within the precincts of the Temple of Castor. Here again, if the evidence to be found in the history of Cicero's exile points in any direction, it points to the tribunal of the tribunes, where Terentia observed the formalities necessary to secure her husband's return. Here also the Valerian tablet is a symbol, and at the same time the visible source, of the tribunician power, which is abused by the enemies of the old order of things. Perhaps in speaking of it by this name Cicero has in mind the fact that it was a Valerius who befriended Terentia.

The exact location of this tablet cannot be determined. It is possible that such tablets were fastened to the movable tribunals of wood, but it is probable that they were generally attached to permanent structures near the places where the magistrates who had to consult them were accustomed to preside. The more important tribunals of the time of Cicero were probably found on the higher ground at the west end of the Forum and Comitium. The Rostra, I think, was often used as a tribunal and its outer surface, perhaps, was utilized for the posting of laws and decrees. It may be that many of the numerous tablets which must have been set up in this region were fastened to the foundation walls of the Temple of Saturn, the Tabularium, the Temple of Concord, the Carcer, and to the bases of the honorary columns and statues which abounded here. I am inclined to believe that this tablet was in the immediate neighborhood of the early Rostra, which was a few meters north of the Arch of Septimius Severus and a short distance in front of the Carcer.

The *tabula Sestia* is mentioned in the defense of Publius Quintius (*Pro Quintio* 6. 25) as the place where Quintius and Naevius were to meet in order to fulfil the terms of a vadimonium. Naevius by various legal devices had avoided settlement of the affairs of the partnership formed between himself and the deceased father of Quintius, refusing even to make a vadimonium. Nevertheless learning on a certain day that Quintius was far enough along on a

journey to Gaul he summoned his friends to meet him next morning at the *tabula Sestia*: tum Naevius pueros circum amicos dimittit ipse suos necessarios ab atriis Liciniis et a faucibus macelli corrogat ut ad tabulam Sestiam sibi adsint hora secunda postridie. When they met there he pretended that he was keeping the terms of the vadimonium and made declaration that he was present and that Quintius was not. The witnesses signed the declaration and the record was sealed. Naevius then applied to the praetor for an order of proscription of the property involved, which was granted. There is nothing in the context to indicate that this *tabula Sestia* was a banker's counter or office. The phrase evidently was used to designate a tribunal where public records, *tabulae maximae*, were accessible, records which guided the praetor in issuing his order. I take this tablet to be one which was inscribed with some law and set up near the court of a magistrate, some of whose official acts were connected with the law. Now the Licinian laws are more appropriately called Sestian. The first plebeian consul elected in accordance with their terms was not Licinius but his colleague in the legislation, Lucius Sextius. Among the provisions of these laws were some relating to the use of public land for stockraising, to the employment of slaves in the country, and to the relief of debtors. The last two points were involved in the dispute between Naevius and Quintius and it is probable that the first was also, since the business of the partnership was the raising of sheep and cattle in Gaul, so that this case may have been within the scope of the Licinian, or Sestian, laws. It is possible, too, that, even if this particular case had nothing to do with them, the magistrate who held court near them had cognizance of it. I believe that the *tabula Sestia* was a tablet inscribed with the Licinian laws. It was probably in the region already mentioned as abounding in such tablets. It ought to be added that tablets of this sort were doubtless moved from place to place when there was need of it, as, for instance, when a tribunal was moved.

A NEW MANUSCRIPT OF CICERO'S *DE SENECTUTE*

BY GEORGE REEVES THROOP

Codex C is a MS in the library of Cornell University. Its catalogue number is MSS B3. It measures 193/10 by 143/10 cm., is bound in calf with gold tooling, and bears upon the back the title: M. T. CIC./PARADOX./DE SENECT./DE AMICIT./ It contains the coat-of-arms and motto of "Le comte D. Boutourlin," undoubtedly the well-known Russian historian, bibliophile, and librarian, Dimitri Boutourlin (17. .-1850), long director of the Imperial Library at Petersburg, whose fine collection of books and manuscripts was sold at auction in Paris in 1839-41. The following flyleaf note, "Vente Monmerqué/13 fr 50c/le 5 Juin 1851," shows that the MS had come into the possession of the eminent French antiquary and book-collector, Louis Jean Nicolas Monmerqué (1780-1860). The MS seems next to have become the property of the noted Parisian publisher, Ambrose Firmin Didot (1790-1876), as is evident from his bookmark. He doubtless purchased it at the Monmerqué sale in 1851, and probably owned it until his death in 1876. It was purchased in Paris, in 1886, by Professor G. L. Burr, for the President White Historical Library, now a part of the library of Cornell.

The MS is a palimpsest of which the under-writing has been removed by abrasion. This under-writing, which is slightly visible in many places, appears to be a cursive hand of probably the thirteenth century. It is undecipherable though almost legible in many places: e. g., on folios 88 *a*, 91 *b*, 107 *b*, 108 *a*, etc. The leaves are in many cases rubbed full of holes in an effort to remove the original writing. The writing itself is on vellum of a yellowish-white color, marred by a few worm-holes. The leaves are of moderate thickness, except several that have been scraped thin by the abrasion.

The MS consists of quaternions with catchword signatures at the bottom of the page. These catchwords are, as usual, the first

words of the text at the top of the opposite page. It contains 123 leaves, of which 25-26 and 74-75 are blanks, and are inserted by the binder between the essays. There are also four blank leaves at the front and the same number at the end of the MS. It is of one column, eighteen lines to a page, twenty-four to thirty letters to a line, with large margins. Ruled lines are drawn with a sharp point, apparently of lead.

The MS contains: (1) *PARADOXA*. Begins on fol. 1 a: *Animadvorti Brute/sepe Catonem*. Ends on fol. 24 b: *inopes et pauperes exti/mandi sunt*. Amen. (2) *CATO MAIOR*. Begins on fol. 27 a: *O TITE si quid ego adiuto/curamve*. Ends on fol. 73 b: *re experti pro/bare possitis*. Amen: / *Marci Tullii Ciceronis/ad Atticum de Senectute/Liber Explicit*. Amen: / *DEO GRATIAS*. (3) *LAELIUS*. Begins on fol. 76 a: *Quintus Mucius au/gur Scevola multa narrare*. Ends on fol. 123 b: *nichil amicitia pre/stabilis esse putetis*. Amen.

The initial letter in each essay is large ($1\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches), is colored in blue and red, and highly ornamented. This, however, is the only trace of the rubricator in the *De senectute*; in the latter, also, a different shade of blue and red was used from that employed in the *Paradoxa* and *De amicitia*. The latter two essays are rubricated throughout—interlocutors, proper names, chapter headings, etc. In the *De senectute* the names of the interlocutors are sometimes written in the text by the first hand; oftener a blank space is left, presumably for their insertion by the rubricator. This space is always supplied with the name written in very small script.

The MS has many glosses and variant readings by a later hand. In the same hand as the glosses are the following captions at the beginning of the three essays, respectively: *De paradossis*, *De senectute*, *De amicitia*. The punctuation is confined to two signs. One of these is the sign of interrogation; the other is the simple point, which is freely used by the writer for comma, semicolon, and period. The hand of the glosses has divided the sentences throughout by very fine upright lines which often can scarcely be discerned.

At the end of the *Paradoxa*, on fol. 24 b, is the following sub-

scription: *MCCCCIIIIo in dictione die XXIIa mensis Junii expletus est hora XXa*. Also at the end of the *De senectute*, on fol. 73 b; *MCCCCIIIIo die (XXa) mensis Aprilis hora XVIII feliciter a me francisco expletus est liber iste*. There is no subscription at the end of the *De amicitia*. On the third paper flyleaf at the end of the book, a neat modern hand has written (1) *Le traité De Senectute a été écrit et terminé par Franciscus en 1404 le 20 Avril à la 18e heure*. (2) *Le même Franciscus a écrit et terminé le traité De Paradoxis le 21 Juin de la même année à la 20e heure*. (3) *Le traité De Amicitia est de la même main*. It is, of course, clear enough that this note has no worth as evidence, and that the subscriptions of the glossator are the source of its information. The statement in regard to the *De amicitia* was of course only surmised from the similarity of the writing of the *De amicitia* to that of the other essays. The French note was probably written by Boutourlin, as the flyleaf may be older than the present binding, which is, I suppose, that of Firmin Didot.

The Latin subscriptions are in the same hand and ink as the readings of the second hand, the glosses, and the captions mentioned above. This ink is of a very pale brown, even when heavily applied, as often occurs. It never approaches the deep black color of the ink in which the text is written, except on a few leaves, where by reason of age the writing has partly faded away. That this lighter shade is not due to the smaller size of the writing is shown by the captions and by a line inserted in the text by a later hand at the bottom of fol. 31 b: *dulcedine morum et affabilitate*. The writing, though heavier perhaps than that of the text, retains here its distinctive light-brown shade.

The writing of the text itself is extremely regular and legible, being apparently that of the Italian book-hand then prevalent. It shows none of the fifteenth-century degeneration which is so noticeable in the glosses and readings of the second hand. Abbreviations, which in that century are so plentiful and so difficult of decipherment, are here confined to a few words, and are exceedingly easy to understand. The letters are not compressed laterally, as is common in the latter part of the fourteenth and in

the fifteenth century. The regularity of the writing is certainly much beyond that usually found in MSS of that date. Nor does it partake in the least of the Renaissance style prevalent in the fifteenth century; the letters are too angular, and do not have the graceful rounded ends and slender upward strokes or tails.

Some specific points may be cited as illustrating the above statements. In the fourteenth century the letter *a*, made with the upper loop open in the the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, closes the top of the loop. This letter is found in our MS, apparently in different stages of development; the letter even occurs with the upper loop entirely open. The usual form is a letter made with the upper loop partly closed; then an extra stroke, very faint, and often not to be discerned except by close examination, is added to the lower part of the upper loop. This latter stroke usually just fails to touch the lower part of the letter. This change in the form of the letter *a*, which took place in the fourteenth century, seems therefore to be felt by the scribe as then going on.

In the glosses, etc., the letter *t* is made with the horizontal stroke at about the middle of the letter. This was the common style in 1404, the date of the glosses. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, this letter was made with the horizontal stroke at the top of the perpendicular; then, about the beginning of the fourteenth century, the perpendicular stroke was slightly lowered. This change continued, until, in the fifteenth century, the letter was made with the horizontal stroke at about the center of the perpendicular, just as in the case of the glosses mentioned above. This letter is found in our MS with the cross-stroke ranging from the very top to a point upon the perpendicular distant perhaps one-fourth of its own length from the top.

The accenting of the letter *i* commenced in the twelfth century, and was in large measure replaced by dots in the fifteenth and even partly in the fourteenth century. No dots are found in our MS. Yet the letter *i* is accented when near *n*, *m*, *u*, *i*, and sometimes in other places, but the accent is also at times omitted even when *i* is near the letters mentioned.

Simple *e* is written for *ae* and *oe*, this had commenced as early

as the sixth century. The cedilla occurs once, however; *eternus*. This is rarely found in fifteenth-century MSS.

From these facts there seems to be no doubt that at least the scribe of the text and the scribe of the glosses were different persons. They seem also to warrant us in placing the date of the text at least fifty years, if not more, prior to the date given in the subscriptions. The omission of the word *liber* in the subscription to the *Paradoxa* might bear upon this. The use of the *iste* in the *De senectute* subscription instead of the usual *hic* may or may not be significant. The omission of a subscription to the *De amicitia* is also noteworthy. It would not be unnatural for a scribe to attach his name to a MS over which he had worked, if that MS were not already provided with a subscription.

While the evidence undoubtedly points to the conclusion that the MS was written as early as 1300-1350, yet owing to the fact that no parallel instances of such postdating of manuscripts can be cited, a more conservative criticism would probably hold to the date given in the text. However, the value of the MS is not materially affected, whether its date be 1300 or 1400.

The *De senectute* may be older than the other essays contained in our MS, as in it the ink seems to have worn off or faded away to a greater extent than in the *Paradoxa* and *De amicitia*. This, however, might be fully explained by its having been more read. The fact that the *De senectute* is not rubricated and that the initial letter is in different colors from those used in the other essays seems to indicate that it was written at a different time. But, as no further evidence can be adduced on this subject, the similarity of writing and of abbreviations in the three essays makes it reasonably certain that they are all by the same hand. Even if this is true, it by no means follows that the treatises were originally thus bound together.

I shall denote the MS by C, the first hand by C¹, the second hand by C². References by page and line are to C. F. W. Mller's edition of Cicero, Leipzig, 1879 (Editio stereotypa, 1898). His text is to be accepted without reserve for all readings which are not noted. Italics in the collation denote words deleted by the scribe but still readable.

The second hand, though later, as shown above, is of almost equal value with the first. It furnishes over three hundred variants, some of which preserve the correct reading against corruptions in the text, many furnish important variants found in other MSS, and many are found nowhere else. The same hand has also written many glosses, few of which, however, are of any importance. Yet in a few instances a gloss preserves the true reading against a corruption or omission in the text; e. g., p. 155. 28 *enim*; 159. 10 *esset*; 143. 24 *sunt*. From the variety of readings quoted by the second hand, it cannot be doubted that several MSS were used in correcting the text. The second hand quotes in several places two variants for one passage of the text; e. g., p. 132. 8 C¹ *adventantis*, C² *coadventantis* and *advenientis*; 155. 16 C¹ *mortis casus habet*, C² *casus mortis habet*, or *casus habet mortis*; etc. Variants are also sometimes added by the first hand; as, p. 134. 27 *nobilis*; 136. 18 *panathethicus*.

The orthography, if not exact, is at least consistent. The scribe seems to have followed a regular spelling in the case of many words which usually vary in the MSS. Thus, always: *quorsum*, *deinde*, *dii*, *nichil*, *michi*, *unquam*, *tanquam*, *quotidie*, *quascunque*, etc., *quendam*, etc., *quicquam*, *littera*, *quatuor*, *repperio*, *autoritas*, *directus*, *valitudo*, *intelligo*, etc., *descriptio*, *vendicare*, *monimenta*, *lacrimis*, *libido*, *maximus* (and always *-imus* in superlative endings), *phylosophya*, etc., *-endum* always for *-undum* in gerunds and gerundives, *adolescens*, etc., *iocundus*, *conditione*, *spetie*, *spacio*, *ociosam*, *admistum*, *hi* and *his* for *ii* and *üis*, but the forms *ei* and *eis* are often employed; the assimilation of prepositions in compound words and like changes are regular, but exceptions occur, as: *affatur*, *afferre*, *appeti*, etc., *colligo*, *comparare*, etc., *expectatis*, *extractis*, etc., *illustrium*, *illudi*, *immissio*, *imbecillus*, etc., *opprimere*, *succumbebat*.

Praenomina are regularly written out, as: *Gaius* for *C.*, *Gneus* for *Cn.*, *Lucius* for *L.*, *Marcus* for *M.* and *M¹.*, *Publius* for *P.*, *Sextus* for *Sex.*, *Spurius* for *Sp.*, *Titus* for *T.* and *Ti.*, *Quintus* for *Q.*, and twice the initial alone is written and blanks are left for the insertion of the remainder: *P - - - Crassus*: *T - - - Pontii*.

Genitives from proper names in *-ius* of the second declension regularly have *-ii*, as: *Publii Licinii Crassi*, *Publii Decii*.

Proper names are often much confused or wrongly spelled, as in most MSS of the *De senectute*. We find on p. 136. 17 *Socratis* (*Isocratis*); 152. 21 *Senocrates* (*Socrates*); 146. 13 *Flaminei* (*Flaminini*); 146. 29 and 146. 35 *Coruncanum*; but 137. 16 and 141. 11 *Coruncanii*; *Affricanus* and *Affricani* in 141. 27 and 143. 27; but rightly in 160. 16, 17; *Fabritii* in 137. 16; also in 146. 24, 34: *Sannite* in 145. 37, and always. We also find *Lisander* in 152. 28, but *Lysander* elsewhere; *Olimpia* in 136. 30 and 142. 36; *Thermophilas* in 142. 22; *Symonidem* in 139. 24; etc.

Abbreviations are common, but neither varied nor difficult to understand. They are most numerous in case of the forms of the relative pronoun, of the enclitic *-que*, and of *-n* and *-m* in connection with the different vowels. Most of the abbreviations which occur are found many times and are consequently easy to interpret.

It is unfortunate that the MS, while being comparatively free from interpolation and especially free from omissions, abounds in transpositions. These are probably traceable, to some extent, to the scribe himself, as few are to be found in any other MS. They seem for the most part to represent an endeavor to arrive at a simpler Latin order; as, p. 139. 23 *liberatus est*; 142. 1 *puer memini*; 149. 21 *maior esse potest*; and in many places.

Interpolations are few in number and are mostly confined to supplying a logical word where it seemed to be omitted from the text. Most of these interpolations also have authority in other MSS and doubtless arose simultaneously in many, from attempts to improve or explain the text; e. g., p. 135. 17 *Ennius ait*; 135. 27 *toga fuit*; 136. 5 *littere erant in eo*; 137. 5 *avocet senes*; etc. One of greater length occurs after *requirere* on p. 143. 5: *nam cursus elatum nunquam retorquebitur*. On p. 135. 4, after *comitate*, a later hand has added at the bottom of the page in a script which imitates the text: *dulcedine morum et affabilitate*. On p. 131. 3, is found the old interpolation: *et qua deprimeris*.

Omissions are extremely rare. The only one worthy of note occurs on p. 140. 16-17, where *alteri . . . odiosum* is omitted as a result of the preceding *odiosum*.

C¹ or C² often furnishes a good and frequently a correct text in the case of readings supported by no or by slight MS authority. Most of the readings which I here cite are commonly adopted by editors. A few are supported by one or more of the better MSS.

E. g.; p. 135. 9 C² *cumque eo*; 135. 20 C¹ *magisque magisque* (coni. Muretus); 135. 19 *enim*] C² *hic*; 136. 7 *ita cupide fruebar tunc*; 136. 18 *et*; 136. 29 *sicut*; 136. 32 C² *anno enim vigesimo*; 136. 35 C¹ *consulibus*; 136. 37 C² *suasi*; 137. 27 C² *decimo septimo anno*; 141. 23 C² *an ne has*; 142. 18 *possem*; 142. 37 *bovem unum utrum igitur*; 143. 18 *in senectute*; 143. 21 *quae*; 144. 19–20 *illa domo mos patrius et disc.*; 144. 35 C² *magno opere*; 145. 29 *posset*; 146. 6 *quorsum* (also on p. 136. 9); 146. 16 C² *exoratus*; 148. 25 *tamen*; 149. 4 *pseudolo*; 149. 12 C² *suade medullam*; 149. 32 *deinde* (also on p. 150. 20); 149. 35 *erecta*; 151. 31 *quam*; 153. 6 C¹ *studio teneamur*; 154. 25 C¹ *morum*; 155. 13 C¹ *est tam*; 155. 22 *quid (quod?) est istud* (coni. Wesenberg); 155. 37 C¹ *vixit*; 156. 7 *cuique*; 156. 10 C¹ *sapienti*; 158. 3 C¹ *saepe profectas*; 158. 8 C¹ *rerum*; 158. 16 C¹ *equidem non enim*; 159. 2 *Apollinis oraculo*; 159. 31 *tum*; 159. 27 C¹ *diutius*; 160. 2 *discedit*; 160. 25 *multo melius* (restored by Bennett from Erfurtensis); 161. 8 C¹ *habeat*.

A study of these readings will show conclusively that C is descended from an excellent source, and one free from many corruptions found even in the oldest MSS. A number of its corruptions, as I said above, seem to be due to its own scribe, though a few are manifestly of an older date; as, p. 131. 2 *versatur pectore*; 134. 27 *non nobilis*; 142. 15 *sex Nestoris*.

On p. 134. 27, C has *non nobilis*, the *non* being in *rasura*. On the margin, by C¹ is *ignobilis alias non nobilis*; the *non* in this case being superscribed by C². The MS doubtless read originally *ignobilis*, with a variant *nobilis* by the same hand. The reading *nobilis* is adopted by early editors, as, P. Baldvinus, Manutius, Graevius, and others; it is said to be taken *ex antiquis codd.*; but none of the MSS now used for the text of the *De senectute* seems to have this variant. *nobilis* was added, I think, by a scribe who wished a word after *Seriphius*, in order to make the sentence correspond to *Atheniensis clarus* in the following line. *nobilis* was then misunderstood as going with *Seriphius*, and was consequently changed to *ignobilis* in most of the MSS. Or, what is less likely, *nobilis* may be the original reading, which, after being changed to *ignobilis* in the MSS, was entirely omitted from the

text of a few as being evidently a gloss on *Seriphius. nobilis*, however, may have arisen from an attempt to improve an earlier *ignobilis*.

On p. 136. 37, C¹ reads *suasissem*, C² *suasi*. This latter reading, so generally adopted from Forchhammer's conjecture, is preserved in no other MS. The word is superscribed above *suasissem* by C² and is itself quite legible; but the sign *alias*, used for denoting readings of C², is here indistinct and might perhaps be taken for an abbreviation of *vel*, a sign which is also used by the glossator. I have found infrequently in other places readings of C² quoted under the sign for *vel*.

On p. 155. 24, only P² A² H² have the correct reading *tu in*; all others having the easy corruption *tum*. C² also preserves here the correct reading. The words are clearly written and plainly divided; by no possibility could they be taken for *tum*.

The citation of a few readings will show that C, notwithstanding its lateness, is not dependent for its text upon any MS or group of MSS. Of the better MSS, L P H A V, its readings agree with those of P and H rather than L and A, and V rather than either; and it sometimes agrees with the latter in preference to a majority of all the MSS. The comparative agreements of C with L A, PH, and V, might accurately be expressed by the increasing ratio 5:6:7; as,

- p. 146. 21 CPH *tam* vs. LAV om. *tam*
- p. 147. 15 CPH *crebro* vs. LAV *credo*
- p. 159. 3 CPH *mihi persuasi* vs. LAV *persuasi mihi*
- p. 147. 2 CPHV *quorsum* vs. LA *quorsus*
- p. 149. 10 CPHV *atqui* vs. LA *atque*
- p. 143. 35 CPHV *morbum* vs. LA *morborum*
- p. 150. 9 CPHV *nonne ea* vs. LA *nonne*
- p. 151. 8 CLA *natura* vs. PHV om. *natura*
- p. 137. 37 CLA *multa* vs. PHV *multo* (or om.)
- p. 148. 14 CLAV *libenter vero* vs. PH *ego vero*
- p. 156. 19 CLAV *ante partorum* vs. PH *peractorum*
- p. 150. 3 CLAV *requiem* vs. PH *requietem*

These instances exemplify the agreements of C with these MSS arranged by classes. In reference to the individual MSS, C agrees

with V, H, P, A, L, in the following descending ratio, 7:6:5:5:4; it will also at times agree with one of them against the other four; as,

- p. 131. 1 CV *adiuto* vs. LAPH *adiuvero*
- p. 145. 29 CV *posset* vs. LAPH *possit*
- p. 156. 10 CV *sapienti* vs. LAPH *sapientibus*
- p. 157. 26 CV *eo* vs. LAPH *hoc* (*et*, etc.)
- p. 157. 27 CV *quis* vs. LAPH *qui*
- p. 158. 9 CV *certa studia* vs. LAPH *studia certa*
- p. 159. 5 CH *sententiae* vs. LAPV *scientiae*
- p. 151. 10 CH *triumphasset* vs. LAPV *triumphavisset*
- p. 143. 21 CH *quae* vs. LAPV *quando* or *quoniam*
- p. 133. 14 CH *consolatione* vs. LAPV *consolatio*
- p. 132. 5 CH *mihi visum est* vs. LAPV *m. e. v. or v. e. m.*
- p. 149. 32 CP *deinde* vs. LAVH *dein*
- p. 135. 23 CP *fugerat* vs. LAVH *fuerat*
- p. 148. 11 CA *nec* vs. LVPH *ne*
- p. 147. 32 CA *pauci iam* vs. LVPH *pauci*
- p. 133. 6 CA *adepti* vs. LVPH *adeptam*
- p. 160. 25 CL *quietatem* vs. AVPH *quietam*
- p. 136. 13 CL *navalesque* vs. AVPH *navalesve*

C agrees with H² in a few very important readings; in some of these they constitute the chief authority for the text. C agrees with H² in preference to H¹ in at least four-fifths of the places where readings of H² are cited. As, p. 137. 13 *seniles*; 142. 9 *vivebat*; 144. 22 *nemini mancipata*; 149. 35 *erecta*; 143. 6 *parti* (*parci*); 145. 34 *tamque pestiferum*; 154. 25 *morum*; 153. 11 *maiores nostri*; 155. 13 *est tam*; 136. 7 *fruebar tunc*; but C agrees with H¹ instead of H² on p. 144. 34 *omnibus* (*in*) *his*, vs. H² *in his*; also on p. 159. 5 C¹H¹ *sententiae*, vs. C²H² *scientiae*.

In relation to the the reading *nemini mancipata* found on p. 144. 22, I will here mention that a late fifteenth-century MS, designated as K, and contained in the Cornell University library, has the following important reading: *nemini emancipata*. The same MS has also on p. 155. 22 the equally important reading: *quod est istud*. These readings, however, may be emendations of the scribe.

In a few important readings C¹ or C² agrees with ERI or one or more of them in preference to a majority of the other MSS.

- p. 141. 23 C²ERI *an ne has* vs. C¹ MSS *annales*
 p. 142. 37 CER¹ *bovum vivum (unum C) utrum igitur* vs. MSS vary
 p. 144. 19 CER *illa domo mos patrius et disc.* vs. MSS corrupt
 p. 146. 8 CER *habendam (om. esse)* vs. MSS *h. e. or e. h.*
 p. 153. 2 CER¹ *recte* vs. MSS *rite*
 p. 158. 8 C¹ERI² *rerum* vs. C²T¹ MSS *studiorum*

Yet we find that C never consistently agrees with any one of these, and at times radically disagrees from them all; as,

- p. 133. 12 C¹ *quam si* vs. C²ERI *quam*
 p. 141. 31 C *ipsa ista* vs. ER *ista ipsa*
 p. 145. 36 C (I) *longior* vs. ER *longinquior*
 p. 150. 3 C *requiem* vs. ER *requietem*
 p. 154. 36 C *sed* vs. ERI *et*
 p. 155. 37 C *vixit* vs. ERI *vixerit*

C¹ or C² often furnishes readings which would be plausible enough if supported by other MS authority. As worthy of notice, I would cite:

- p. 133. 23 *vetustum*; 133. 33 C² *hoc futurum est*; 134. 35 C² *efferent*; 136. 4 C *quae scientia iuris et augurandi*; 137. 6 C² *infirmum*; 137. 11 C² *ab his*; 138. 31 C¹ *florescentis*; 139. 14 C¹ *qui propter*; 140. 2 *serunt*; 143. 15 C¹ *opertus*; 150. 1 ego] *ergo*; 150. 5 *tantillo*; 151. 7 *rerum rusticarum*; 153. 24 *aut iam etiam de*; 154. 26 *at tamen haec morositas*; 155. 35 *scriptum est (om. video)*; 156. 10 C¹ *vivendum*; 156. 12 C¹ *processeris*; 158. 28 C¹ *terram*; 160. 3 C¹ *tam mortis*.

A complete collation of the MS. follows:

- p. 131. 1 C¹ *adiuto*, C² *adiuvero*. C¹ *levasso*, C² *levavero*—2 *versatur pectore*—3 *et qua deprimeris etquid erit pretii*—4 *michi hic*. C¹ *iisdem*, C² *eisdem*—7 C¹ *certe*, C² *certo*—9 C¹ *moderationem*, C² *modum rationem*—

- p. 132. 1 *non cog. sol.*—2 *te*] *om.*—3 *te quibus*—5 *michi visum est*—7 *commune michi*—8 *etiam*] *om.* C¹ *adventantis*, C² *coadventantis* and *advenientis*—9 C¹ *immodice*, C² *modice*—10 *sicuti*. *certe*—11 *cum michi*—14 *abstulerit vel absterserit*—16 *d. s. l.*—18 *degere possit*—20 *de senectute ad te*—21 C¹ *Aristarcus*, C² *Aristillus*—22 *Marcho*—26 *consueverit*—27 *attribuito*—29 C¹ *boni enim*, C² *iam enim*—32 *cum*] *tum*—35 *ethna*—37 *Scipio et Leli difficilem*.

- p. 133. 3 *a se ipsis*—4 *potest malum*—6 *sed eandem omnes*. C¹ *adepti*, C² *adeptam*—8 *putassent*—9 C¹ *cur*, C² *qui*—11 *esset gravis*—12 *quam si*—14 *consolatione*. C¹ *posset*, C² *potest*—16 *vestroque*—22 *aliquid esse*—23 C¹ *fructibus*, C² *frugibus*. *victum vel vetustum*—25 *enim est. modo*] *more*—29 *et volumus*. *certe*] *recte*—33 *gratum hoc*. C¹ *sit*, C² *est*—35 *aliquam longam. vel conficias quam*.

p. 134. 1 vero ut—2 veteri—3 C¹ quas, C² que (quae)—4 quae] itemque—10 evenirent omnia—12 se laborum et lib., iam lax.—14 omnium quoque—17 C² inequalitas—27 non nobilis, or ignobilis alias non nobilis (on margin). C² hercle—28 essem non nobilis nec tu si Atheniensis esses.—30 non levis—31 ne] nec—32 enim sunt omnino—35 C¹ efferunt, C² efferent—36 homines nec in.

p. 135. 1 C¹ benefactorum, C² beneficiorum—8 fuerat primum. C¹ cum quo ego quarto, C² cumque eo, C² cumque ego—11 deinde edilis. sum pretor—13 et suasor. cinthie—15 C² plene. Hanibalem—16 C² iuvenem—17 Ennius ait—18 unus qui nobis—19 C¹ non enim, C² non hic—20 C² magisque magisque—21 receperat—23 fugerat—25 C¹ arridens, C² ridens—27 toga fuit—28 C² resistit—29 Picenum—30 augur enim q cum (enim outside of line)—34 nichil est—35 Marci filij—36 est] C² cum.

p. 136. 2 civium] hominum. magnus fuit—4 C¹ que (quae) scīa iuris et augurandi, C² iuris augurii—5 littere erant in eo. omnia enim—7 fruebar tunc, C² tamen—10 C² videtur—12 ut] aut—13 expugnatores. C¹ navalesque, C² -ve—14 ut] C² et—15 C¹ atque, C² ac. C¹ eleganter, C² eleganter. C¹ levis, C² lenis—16 et (also in 18)—17 mortuus est. Socratis—18 C¹ panatheniacus (C¹ in marg. panathethicus)—19 se dicitur—20 Leontius—21 neque] C² nec—22 ex eo] C² ex quo—23 esse vellet—24 quo—27 fecimus—29 sicut. sepe] C² forte—30 Olimpia—31 et equi (C² equidem) et victoris equi (C² cuius) senectuti—32 C¹ annum enim unde vigesimum, C² anno enim vigesimo—34 Accilius—35 C¹ consulibus, C² consule—37 C¹ suasissem annos, C² suasi.

p. 137. 1 C¹ videntur, C² putantur—3 C¹ delectare, C² delectari—5 avocet senes—6 C¹ infirmum—7 fere privet omnibus—8 C¹ harum, C² earum—9 et quamque—12 C¹ an eis, C² ab his. in iuven.—13 seniles—14 administrantur. nichil ne—15 Scipio socer—18 Appii Claudii. accedam qui—19 sentetia—21 illa] C² ea. prosecutus—24 dementi sese flexere. C¹ ruina, C² via—26 C¹ hoc, C² hec (haec). egit] C² agit—27 C¹ septemdecim annos, C² decimo septimo anno—30 fuisse sane—38 C¹ his qui, C² ut si qui. agere nichil—36 pupi—37 C¹ multa, C² multo. C² velocitatibus.

p. 138. 5 bellorum] C² laborum—6 C² rescribo—7 C¹ sunt, C² sint. Cartagini—8 bellum inferant—12 trigesimus—14 censore.—15 cum consul—16 ad centesimum si annum—18 cominus—19 et sententia—23 gerunt] C² tenent. C² appellantur—24 externas—25 sust.] subst.—26 C¹ repperietis, C² repperies and invenietis—28 percunctantur ut est Nevii poete (-ae) posteriori libro—29 C¹ sed, C² et—30 C¹ proveniebant vel proventabant, C² pveniebant—31 C² scilicet. C¹ florecentis, C² florentis. C² senectutis

p. 139. 1 in etate—2 novi eos—3 sunt etiam sed—6 C¹ senum, C² quenque senem or quenquam senem—7 omnia] C² si autem—8 qui sibi—

12 neque] C² nec. sedetiam—14 C¹ qui propter, C² propter quod—20 Edippum—22 C¹ a desipiente factum, C² desipientis—23 hunc] om.—24 Hesiodum. Symonidem. Tersicorem—25 Socratem. Gorgiam—26 Pictagoram—27 C¹ Xenocratem, C² Yxocratem. Cleantem—29 Stoycum. in] C² a. obmutiscere—30 in his omnibus—32 C² vocare—35 C² frugibus—33 his aliis hoc sit minus mirum—37 in annum.

p. 140. 1 C¹ his, C² eis. C¹ nichil, C² nil. C¹ sciunt, C² sciant—2 serunt—3 synephebis—7 prodesse—8 qui illud Ennii idem est—9 nichil—10 apportas. C² satis—11 diu quis. vult—12 vult *non conspicit*. quidem que—13 vult—14 viciosius dixit—16 se ea etate *eum* esse—22 me hic vobis qui michi—23 C² videte—26 quid quod. quid] C² qui(?)—31 C¹ expellere, C² explere—34 in fidibus. in divinis litteris.

p. 141. 1 num plusquam—2 vires tauri. elephantis—4 contemptior esse—8 num vero. tuiipse. nugator] C² migrator—9 nobilitatus es—10 Sextus Emilius—17 in senectute—19 persepe ipsa—20 C¹ disertam, C² diserti. compta—23 C¹ annales quidem viros senectute relinquimus, C² an ne has quidem vires senectutis relinquemus—24 C² adolescentulos—25 instituant instruant—26 et] om.—27 Africanus—31 ipsa ista. et si—34 in eo sermone.

p. 142. 1 puer memini—4 etatis viribus. relinqueret—7 videtis ne—5 meipso—9 iam enim tertiam. vivebat—10 nimius—12 ad quam. C² profuebat—14 Ayacis—15 C¹ sex. Nestoris, C² at quinque. sibi si—16 troya—18 possem—22 C¹ militaris, C² plebis or C² militum. Thermophilas.—23 Marco Accilio Glabrione consulibus, C² consule—24 non] C² nec—26 nec] C² neque—27 C¹ manet, C² monet—28 velis] C² velit—30 convenire (om. me) valuit, C² voluit—31 quin (or quum) fuerim—32 uterque vis. nec—35 ne ille quidem (om. non.). ne] C² non.—36 Olimpie pedes per—37 bovem unum utrum igitur. sust.] subst.

p. 143. 2 utere—3 C¹ abest non, C² absit ne—5 cursus unus—6 parti. aetatis] om.—7 est post data ut enim infir. (om. et.).—10 C² recipi—11 habitus Massinissa—12 natus] C² nactus—13 inequo—14 C¹ ascendere, C² descendere. imbre—15 C¹ opertus, C² operto. C¹ corporis siccitatem, C² sinceritatem—18 in senectute—19 non sunt—21 quae. non] om.—22 sust.] subst.—23 ad hoc q. n. p. quidem sed nec.—24 C¹ officium, C² officii. C¹ ita imbecilles (om. sunt but in gloss), C² imbecilli.—27 Africanus—30 C¹ valentior, C² uberior—34 C¹ cuiusque, C² eiusque. C¹ com-pescenda, C² compensanda—35 pugnandum que est tanquam (C² sicut) contra morbum sic (C² si)—36 habenda est.

p. 144. 1 vero] C² tamen—4 extinguuntur—5 de fatigatione—6 se exercendo—7 comicus. hos.—9 ignavie somniculoseque—13 omnium sed stultorum—14 et quinque—18 eum serui—20 mos patrius—21 se ipsam—22 C¹ nemini mancipata, C² menti—23 proba in (om. proba in 25)—26 sed animo—29 quam maxime. augurum et pontificum—31 Pictagoreo

rumque—33 haec] he (hae)—34 omnibus in his—35 C¹ magnopere, C² magno opere.

p. 145. 1 C¹ quas, C² quae. nequirem] C² non possem—6 dubito—8 equitur etiam—9 dic. carere—10 C¹ illud aufert a, C² id—12 Archite—14 nullam esse—20 nasci dicebat—22 strupra—23 voluptatibus—25 C¹ atque, C² ac—26 esse tam—29 posset—30 aliquem aliquando—33 quo circa—34 tamque pestiferum—36 longior.—37 Sannite.

p. 146. 1 C¹ seperati, C² superati. Titus Victorius—2 Architam. Nearcus—6 Ap. Claudio] Publio Camillo Claudio. quorsum—3 romani populi—6 quorsum—7 C¹ haec, C² hoc. C¹ intelligatis, C² intelligeretis—8 C¹ intelligentia, C² prudentia. esse] om.—9 C¹ effecerit, C² efficeret—11 ac mentis. perstringit—12 comertium—13 Flaminei fratrem consulem—16 C¹ exhortatus, C² exoratus—17 C¹ illorum, C² eorum—18 rei sententia—20 neutiquam *quam*. . prob. pot.] C² procrastinari poterant—23 a maioribus—25 quod] qui—26 a Thessalo civi audisset esse—29 Coruncanum—33 qui se (om. qui in 32)—35 Coruncanus. cum] tum. tum] tunc.—36 Publii Decii.

p. 147. 2 quorsum.—6 C¹ vinolentia, C² violentia—7 insomniis—11 pisces hamo. careat—13 Marci filium—14 sepe senem—15 cereo] crebro—16 illi gloria—17 iam primum—19 sunt constitute sed sacris y deis matris magne, C² magne matris—20 igitur] enim—21 erat tunc. qua] C² quo—22 C¹ mitiora, C² minora. enim] om.—23 ipsius volup. quam] C² potius—25 C¹ accubitationem, C² accubationem (cf. *De. off. i.* 35. 128).—26 nominaverunt convivium—27 C¹ tunc, C² tum (so C¹ and C² in 38)—29 C¹ eodem, C² eo—32 pauci iam—33 -que] C² quoque—34 C¹ ausit potus et cibi, C² potiones et cibos—36 videar indixisse bellum. est] om. (and add in 37, modus est).

p. 148. 1 voluptatibus ipsis. senectutem sensu.—4 C¹ summo magisterio, C² summo magistro. C¹ siphosio, C² siprosio—5 C¹ refrigerantia, C² refrigeratio—7 C² prosequi—9 C¹ producimur vario sermone, C² vario sermone producimur—10 This line given to Laelius—11 ne] nec—13 C¹ ab, C² ex. quidam iam quidem affecto, C² confecto—14 C¹ veneris, C² veneris. dii. libenter vero—15 C¹ a, C² ab. C¹ aut furioso, C² ac curioso—16 C¹ vero, C² enim—18 C² is caret qui—25 etiam tamen—26 C¹ delectatur, C² letatur. propter] prope—27 eas] C² ea. in tantum—28 quae animum delectant—29 contentionum—31 aliquid—32 C¹ officioso, C² ociosa—33 videbamus] C² vidimus—34 C¹ et, C² atque. C.] om.—37 incepisset.

p. 149. 1 predicere nobis—3 suo bello punico—4 pseudolo—5 sum natus—6 C¹ Centurio Tuditanoque, C² Centhenno, C² tuditano—8 pontificis—10 atque] atqui—11 senes] C² studiis—12 C¹ suadet, C² suade medullam—13 C² videbam—16 doctrine sunt. atque] atqui—18 C¹ est, C² sit—19 quodam ait—21 maior esse potest—23 C¹ non, C² nec—27 cum maiore, C² maiori—29 ipsa natura—30 C¹ accipit, C² excipit—31 id hoc

occatum—32 deinde—34 enixa—35 erecta—36 e quibus cum emerit—37 C¹ spice, C² spici. C¹ structam, C² structo.

p. 150. 1 C¹ morsum, C² morsus. ego] ergo—3 C¹ requiem, C² requietem—5 tantillo—6 C¹ acino vinaceo. C² acina vinacio—8 C¹ ramos ac truncos, C² truncos ramosque. plante vites propagines sarmenta radices non ne ea—12 om. eadem but in gloss—16 ineunte itaque—18 sese—20 gustatu acerba—21 tempore—22 cum] tum—24 ipsa cultura et ipsanatura—25 aminiculorum—26 iugatio] coniugatio—27 quam] C² que (quae)—28 C¹ fossiones, C² fossationes.—29 terra multo—32 Exiodus. ne] nec—34 seculis fuit ante. Laertem—35 eum before agrum—37 sed etiam ortis.

p. 151. 1 C¹ pomeriis, C² pomariis. et apium—4 prosequi—5 oblectamina. C¹ ea ipsa, C² hec (haec)—6 C¹ ignoscite—7 et studio] a studio. rerum rusticarum—8 natura.—9 C¹ videar vindicare, C² vindicare videar, C² videar excusare—10 triumphasset—14 C¹ temporis, C² temporum—15 C² pondus auri—17 C¹ his, C² eis—18 non efficere senectutem iocundam—20 tunc—21 quinto—23 Hala. Aulus, a gloss—24 Emilius—25 accersebatur (so accersebant in 26)—27 C¹ non igitur eorum, C² num igitur horum—28 C² delectabant—29 an ulla vita possit esse beator hac neque enim solum officio delector quod—31 quam dixi. C² salubris—32 C¹ et copia, C² copiaque—33 C¹ ut quoniam hec quidam eorum desiderant, C² ut hec quidem quoniam quidam—37 enim porco.

p. 152. 2 supervacanei—4 aut de—5 C¹ brevi predicam, C² precidam, C² breviter libabo—7 spetie—8 C¹ delectat, C² oblectat—9 C¹ aut, C² eque. vel] C² aut—10 C¹ aut igni, C² vel igni—11 sibi ergo habeant. ergo] C² igitur—12 C¹ sibi pilam, C² et pilam—14 C¹ atque thesseras, C² et thesaras. C¹ libebit, C² licebit. utrum—15 C¹ potest esse senectus, C² esse potest—17 C¹ sciatis, C² faciatis—19 C¹ ethonomicus, C² equonomicus—21 Senocrates. cribotolo in gloss, crythobolo in text—22 Cyrum regem persarum minorem—23 ingenio virum—26 communem—27 et consit.—28 Lisander—30 C¹ suavitates, C² suavitatem—31 a floribus—33 atque] et. illa] C² ista—36 istarum] illarum.

p. 153. 1 persarum—2 gemmis fulgentem. rite vero] recte vero. (gl. certe)—3 ferunt] C² dicunt—4 C¹ licet frui, C² frui licet. C¹ non, C² nec—6 C¹ studio teneamur, C² studia teneamus—8 C¹ vitam produxisse, C² perduxisse—10 C¹ quadraginta et sex, C² sex et triginta—11 itaque. maiores nostri—12 cursus illi—13 etas extrema huius—14 media erat—16 C¹ Accilio Calvino, C² Calatino (om. A.)—17 elogicum unicum—18 et populi—19 notum est totum carmen—20 C¹ est, C² esset—22 quem] C² que—23 de Scipione Affricano—24 ante] etiam—26 C² honorata—29 C¹ meam senect., C² eam me senect.—30 institua sit. id efficitur—34 capit] C² accipit.

p. 154. 1 C¹ bene morate sunt, C² obtime morata est.—3 C¹ cuius mentionem feci, C² cuius modo feci mentionem. aiunt dic.—5 C² in tantum—7 C¹ traditum, C² proditum—8 C¹ theatris, C² theatrum. C¹

consensu, C² consessu—9 ei nusquam—10 accessit—13 C¹ datus esset multiplex, C² esset multiplex datus—15 nolle facere. C¹ nostro, C² vestro—17 C² primatum. C² nec—20 C² corporum—23 C¹ istriones, C² istoriones. C² corruisse in extremo actu—25 C¹ queruntur, C² querimus. C¹ morum, C² morbi—26 at tamen hec morositas—27 C¹ ullius, C² illius—28 C¹ iuste videtur, C² posse videatur—30 C¹ omnia tamen, C² tam—31 cum] tum. fiunt] C² fuerint (?)—32 invita—33 duritas—34 res sese—35 natura. C² coaccessit—36 sed. C¹ aliam, C² alia—37 avaritia] C² avarus.

p. 155. 2 minus vie (viae) restat—5 etatem videtur habere—6 non longe potest abesse—7 C¹ qui in t. l. et. cont. vitam esse non viderit, C² qui mortem cont. esse in t. l. et. non viderit, etc.—10 C¹ ducit eum, C² eum deducit. fructus eternus—11 esse certe inveniri nichil—13 C¹ est tam, C² quamquam quis etiam stultus quamvis sit adolescens, C¹ adolescens sit—15 esse. illa etas.—16 C¹ mortis casus habet, C² casus mortis habet, C² casus habet mortis—18 perpauci—19 nisi accideret—20 enim et ratio—22 quid est istud—24 tum inopt. C¹ tum inexp. C² tu in—25 ad. O scipio—26 communem esse—28 enim] est and enim in gloss—29 habere] om.—30 C¹ nec quid sperat quod habet, C² quod speret quidem. C¹ et . . . meliori, C² at . . . meliore—31 quod id] cum id. conditione—32 vixit diu—33 in vita hominis—34 supremum. Tarsiorum—35 video] est—36 Archon. Gadibus] grandis. regnavit—37 C¹ vixit centum viginti, C² exx vixerit. ne] nec.

p. 156. 1 C¹ sed michi quidem nec diuturnum quicquam, C² quicquid. (gloss, sed michi ne diuturnum quidem quicquam).—2 extremum est—4 C¹ benefactis recte, C² recte facis—5 C¹ unquam, C² usquam—7 cuique—8 C¹ placet, C² placeat—9 est fabula—10 C¹ sapienti usque in finem plaudite vivendum est, C² veniendum, C² sapientibus usque ad plaudite veniendum—12 C¹ processeris, C² processerit—14 auctumnumque—15 enim] C² etiam—16 C¹ vero, C² autem—17 C¹ de metendis, C² metendis, C² metiendis. C² accomoda—18 autem] C² enim—23 itaque sic (om. sic in 24)—25 senes autem cum sua sponte sic nulla adhibita vi ut cons.—28 si cruda sunt vi avelluntur. C¹ cocta, C² coacta—29 sic vis ad. vitam aufert—35 C¹ possis et tamen mortem contemnere, C² possit (gloss, quoad possis).—37 Pysistrato tiranno.

p. 157. 1 C¹ spe, C² re—2 C¹ resisteret, C² obsisteret. resp. dic. sen.] respondit senectute—3 finis est. vivendi] C² vite—5 coaugmentavit. ut aed.] aut ed.—6 C¹ destruxit, C² destruit. facillime—7 hominem] C² hominum—11 Pythagoras. C¹ sine iussu, C² iniussu—13 C² recedere. elogium est—14 mortem suam—15 esse carum se—17 C¹ nec, C² neque—20 consequitur. si aliquis—25 nemo esse. est certe. et id inc.—26 an eo ipso die. ab omnibus—27 qui] quis—28 videtur esse opus—29 C¹ recorder non tantum, C² recorder. est] om.—30 C¹ interemptus, C² interfectus—31 Attilium—34 corporibus suis] C² vi corporis sui—35 C¹ prelio, C² ignominia.

p. 158. 1 C¹ nec, C² ne—2 passus est carere. quod] quas—3 C¹ sepe, C² esse—4 C¹ erecto, C² recto. unde nunquam se red.—5 C¹ quod, C² quid. C¹ hi qui, C² hi quidem—7 C¹ extimescunt, C² extimescent. quidem ut michi—8 C¹ rerum, C² studiorum—9 certa studia—10 sunt et—12 eius] huius. ne] num—13 sunt autem—14 *occidunt* etiam—16 mortis affert maturum. equidem non *enim*—17 quid] quod—18 melius cernere michi—19 tu Publi Scipio tuque Gai Leli—24 C¹ altissimo, C² aptissimo—26 C¹ scilicet in locum, C² locum (om. scilicet in).—28 C¹ terram, C² terras—30 C¹ non, C² nec—31 sed etiam. ita in gloss—33 Pictag. et Pictag.—34 qui cum. nominati quondam—37 die vite (vitae).

p. 159. 1 C² disseruit (?)—2 apollinis oraculo—3 michi persuasi—5 C¹ providentia, C² prudentia. C¹ sententie, C² scientie—7 animus agitur—8 ipse se. ne] nec—9 sit] C² esset—10 esset] om. (but in gloss)—11 admistum. C¹ disparque suique diss., -que] C² atque—12 C¹ posset, C² possit—14 C¹ pluraque, C² pleraque. C¹ qui, C² quod—16 arripere] accipere—17 fere sunt—19 dixit. karissimi—21 nec] neque—22 videbatis meum—25 C² videbatis—27 C¹ eorum, C² illorum. C¹ diutius, C² iustius—29 persuaderi nunquam—30 C¹ exissent, C² excessissent—31 tum—33 admistione—36 et cet.—37 discedant.

p. 160. 2 discedit—3 C¹ tam mortis, C² morti tam—7 C¹ sunt, C² sint—8 C¹ cum plane se vinculis corporis *relaxaverint*, C² *laxaverint*, C² cum se plane corporum vinculis *relaxaverint*—9 C¹ colite, C² colitote—10 C¹ interitus est, C² interiturus—12 C¹ pulcritudinem omnem, omnem] C² communem—14 Cyrrus vero hec quidem—16 Paulum et Affricanum (bis).—17 C¹ *et* multos, C² multo—20 ipsos] posse—21 an ne. meipso—23 isdem] iisdem—25 C¹ quietatem, C² quietam. multo melius—26 sine ullo labore et contemnere traducere, C² contentione (?)—28 C² de vita—29 et nisi ita—31 C¹ immortalitatis gloriam, C² *immortalem*—33 et quisque stultissimus. is] C² his—34 C¹ cernit, C² cernat—35 C¹ cuius, C² cui—37 C¹ vivendi, C² *vivendo*. vero] enim.

p. 161. 1 habeo. etiam illos. C¹ unde, C² de quibus—2 C¹ *con-*scripsi, C² *conscripsi*—4 C¹ neque tanquam pilam retorsit, C² nec retorserit. quis] C² qui—5 C¹ ex hac vite etate repueriscam tenera, C² repetam—7 enim vita habet—8 C¹ sane habeat, C² habet sane—10 C¹ licet, C² libet—11 C¹ indocti, C² docti—13 C¹ et ex vita hac ita, etc., C² et ex vita hac ex hospitio discedo non tanquam domo—14 e] om. (ex in gl.). diversorum—15 nobis dedit non habitandi *dedit*—16 ad illud. C² divinatorum humanorum—17 C¹ cum ex hac turba et colluvione, C² *turbe colluvione*—18 solum ad eos—21 C² *accrematum*—22 eius me non—23 ipsi] ipse—27 C¹ igitur, C² michi—32 dilector—33 C¹ morior totus, C² mortuus—34 C¹ ut hunc, C² ne hunc.

p. 162. 1 sic et—2 defatigationem—3 C¹ societate, C² *sacietate*

LIVY'S USE OF *NEQUE* AND *NEVE* WITH AN IMPERATIVE OR SUBJUNCTIVE

BY EMORY B. LEASE

The present investigation has two objects in view, the one syntactic, to discover the principles that determined Livy's use of one of these particles in preference to the other;¹ the other formal, to ascertain to what extent his use of the longer or shorter form of each was in harmony with the general rules² governing the use of other particles which likewise appear in a double form, as *atque*—*ac*, *neque*—*nec*, *sive*—*seu*, and *deinde*—*dein*.³ For convenience, the matter of form will be taken up first.

I. FORMAL

A. HISTORICAL

1. *Prose*.—It may be said in a general way that where particles appear in two forms the shorter put in their appearance later and were not used extensively until a comparatively late period in the development of the language. The first to be considered are *neu* and *seu*, and a tabular form of exposition has been adopted, to exhibit more clearly the facts of their use.

Prose	Sc. de Bacch.	Cato Agr.	Varro R. R.	Lex Bant.	Lex Acil.	Lex Agr.	Lex Munic.	Lex Col. Gen. Ital.	Cic. Or. et Phil.	Caesar	Nepos	Sallust	Livy	Tacitus	Suetonius (11m)
<i>Neve</i> ..	14	13	5	13	20	38	44	103	34	8	3	5	32	11	5
<i>Neu</i> ...	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	1	16	44	16	1
<i>Sive</i> ...	0	5	4	2	2	4	5	6	265	27	4	2	61	93	6
<i>Seu</i> ...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	4	185	100	9

¹ "Wünschenswert wäre eine Untersuchung über den Gebrauch von *neve* im Vergleich mit dem von *neque*."—Schmalz *Antibarbarus* II, p. 145.

² In this investigation, as in those preceding, the latest Teubner texts were used, and MS variants noted. Owing to the occasional confusion of the forms by the scribes, absolute accuracy cannot of course be claimed for the results. It is maintained, however, that they are sufficiently accurate to show the general rules observed in the use of these particles. The evidence of contemporary inscriptions is of course important, and this will be found to corroborate the statements here made.

³ For the writer's previous treatment of *atque* and *ac* cf. *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, pp. 414 f.; of *neque* and *nec*, *Class. Rev.* XVI (1902), pp. 212 f.; of *deinde* and *dein*, *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXVIII (1907), pp. 387 f.

Remarks. It is to be noted that: (1) The 5 occurrences of *neu* in Cato *Agr.* are read in two passages. The striking exception to the general rule, therefore, that in prose *neu* was not used until the time of Caesar and Sallust, throws some doubt upon the correctness of the MS tradition in these two passages. (2) With Caesar¹ and particularly Sallust begins a decided break from the earlier usages. In Caesar *neu* reaches as high a proportion as 69.2 per cent., in Sallust even higher, 76.2 per cent. Livy follows with 57.9 per cent., Tacitus with 59.2 per cent. Suetonius (Ihm), however, uses *neu* only once, *Iul.* 42. 1, but *neve* 5 times, Curtius, on the other hand, *neu* 4 times, *neve* not at all.

a) A striking contrast is found between the frequency of *neve* (*neu*) in a legal sphere, as in *Col. Gen. Iul.*² 102 times, and its rarity in biography, as in Nepos, 4 times. It is noteworthy also that, whereas this particle was used 76 times by Livy and 27 times by Tacitus, it was not used at all by the Auct. Her. and in only one passage by Seneca (prose), *Ep.* 7. 8, with no variant noted by Hense,³ and in only two by Justin (R.), 6. 3. 8: 18. 4. 10.

b) Sallust is conspicuous for his fondness for the forms *neu* and *seu*, and Curtius used only the form *neu*, but *sive* 33 times.

c) The history of *seu* presents similar phenomena; its appearance in prose literature begins with 5.7 per cent. in Cicero, rises to 34.1 per cent. in Caesar, 65.7 per cent. in Sallust, and reaches its greatest height in Livy, 75.2 per cent.

d) Both in his use of *neu* and of *seu* Livy follows Sallust rather than Cicero.

e) Cicero objected to the form *neu*, but not to *seu*. The latter form was not used by Auct. Her. also, but *sive* is found 7 times.

f) In the *Lex Rubria*, 49 B. C., neither *neu* nor *seu* nor *nec* was used, but *neve* 4 times and *sive* 3 times, and *neque* 8 times. Later usage may be illustrated by Quintilian, in whom *sive* is

¹ For Caesar Kübler's ed. was used, and for Sallust, Eussner's. To Meusel *Lex Caes.* add B. G. 1. 26. 6 and B. C. 1. 64. 2.

² For the inscriptions referred to Schneider's *Dial. Ital. exempla* was used with the exception of the *Lex Munic.*, *Lex Col. Gen. Iul.*, where Kübler *Caes.* III. 2. was consulted.

³ Joehring *De Particulis*, p. 51 says (the statement is quoted by Hense to Sen. *Ep.* 123. 7): "*neve* apud Senecam nusquam inveni." In his tragedies, however, this particle is used: *neve* Her. Fur. 655, 681, Troad. 553, Phoen. 556, Oed. 73, Agam. 184, Thyest. 94, Oct. 254, 271; *neu* Phaedr. 1250. *Neve* (*neu*) is, therefore, found 12 times in Seneca!

found 77 times,¹ *seu* 17 times (18 per cent.), by Tacitus, *sive* 99 times, *seu* 104 (51.2 per cent.), and by Suetonius (Ihm), *sive* 6 times, *seu* 9 (60 per cent.). In strong contrast to these stood Seneca *Phil.* (prose), who used *sive* 160 times and *seu* twice, *N. Q.* 2. 59. 3, with no variants noted by Gercke. As Seneca did not use *neu*, the use of *seu* in this one passage may be accounted for by his fondness for variety of expression: *sive* *sive* *seu* *seu*.

With the growth in the use of *neu* and *seu* may be compared that of *ac* and *nec*. The following table shows the growth of *ac* in history.

History	Sallust	Caesar	Nepos	Livy	Velleius	Val. Max.	Curtius	Tacitus	Suetonius
<i>Atque</i>	277	433	69	1,011	58	155	62	312	217
<i>Ac</i>	110	189	42	1,747	122	302	147	893	627

It is a striking fact that there is a nearly regular increase in the use of *ac* from 28.4 per cent. in Sallust to 30.6 per cent. in Caesar, 37.8 per cent. in Nepos, 63.4 per cent. in Livy, 67.7 per cent. in Velleius, 66.1 per cent. in Val. Max., 70.3 per cent. in Curtius, 74.1 per cent. in Tacitus, and 74.3 per cent. in Suetonius. Note the contrast between the 28.4 per cent. in Sallust and 74.3 per cent. in Suetonius.

Similarly *nec* increases from 0.09 per cent. in Sallust (*neque* = 206, *nec* = 2) and 0.06 per cent. in Nepos (*neque* = 155, *nec* = 1) to 8.08 per cent. in Caesar (*neque* = 405, *nec* = 39), to 71.5 per cent. in Livy (first two books of each decade *neque* = 159, *nec* = 398), but to 53.2 per cent. in Tacitus (*neque* = 445, *nec* = 506). In Petronius the proportion reached as high as 77.2 per cent. (*neque* = 49, *nec* = 166).² Late Latin usage may be illustrated by Ma-

¹ Bonnell *Lex. Quint.*, s. v. "*sive*," cites only 34 occurrences of *sive* and 4 of *seu*. To *sive* (*seu*) "*simpliciter*" add 1. 4. 20; 5. 10. 53; 74; 8 pr. 25, a usage found in all six times.

² Varro's usage, however, is exceptional: in *L. L.* and *R. R.* he uses *neque* 205 times, *nec* 77 times (= 27.3 per cent.). Cato *Agr.* used *neque* 28 times, and *nec* twice (6.6 per cent.).

crobius, *Sat. i.*, where *nec* reaches as high as 84.2 per cent., and by Augustine *Civ. D. i.*, where it reaches 87 per cent.

So also *dein*: contrast 4 per cent. in Cicero, 10 per cent. in Caesar, 15 per cent. in Livy, with 66 per cent. in Tacitus. Livy's usage by decades is as follows:

Decades	<i>Deinde</i>	<i>Dein</i>
First.....	233	30
Third.....	194	54
Fourth.....	203	27
41-45.....	83	14
Total.....	713	125

In contrast to the usage of Tacitus stands Seneca *Phil.*, who did not use *dein* at all in his prose. *Deinde*, on the other hand, is found 170 times in Seneca *Dial.* alone. In Suetonius (*Ihm*) *deinde* was used 71 times, *dein* 18 times, 20.2 per cent.

2. *Poetry*.—Here metrical considerations had much to do with a more extended use of *neu* than we find in prose.

Poetry	Plautus	Terence	Vergil	Horace	Ovid	Catullus	Tibullus	Propertius	Seneca
<i>Neve</i>	23	2	10	4	70	0	1	7	9
<i>Neu</i>	11	2	21	19	18	3	14	5	1

Poetical usage may, therefore, be illustrated as follows: *neu* is represented by 32.4 per cent. in Plautus, by 50 per cent. in Terence, by 67.7 per cent. in Vergil, by 82.6 per cent. in Horace, by 20.5 per cent. in Ovid, but in Seneca by 10 per cent. Of the elegiac poets, Catullus with *neu* at 100 per cent. and Tibullus at 93.3 per cent. show a contrast to Propertius with *neu* at 41.7 per cent., who in this regard also is more archaic. Catullus uses only *neu*, Tibullus only *seu*, and Propertius has about the same proportion for each, 41.7 per cent. for *neu* and 43.9 per cent. for *seu*.

B. *NEU* AND *SEU* BEFORE A VOWEL

*Neu*¹ like *ac* and *dein*,² like *nec* always in Caesar and generally in Cicero, was avoided before a vowel, as was to be expected from its origin.³ *Neu* never appears before a vowel in Cato *Agr.* (5),⁴ Plautus (11), Terence (2), Sallust (22), Cicero,⁵ Caesar (18), Nepos (1), Catullus (3), Tibullus (14), Propertius (5), Ovid (18), Vergil (20), Horace (19), and in Tacitus (31) only once, *Ann.* 15. 63. Livy also paid some attention to this rule; for out of the 44 times that he uses *neu* it occurs only 5 times before a vowel, 3 of these being with a second *neu* before a consonant (8. 32. 15; 25. 7. 4, 38. 5). It is to be noted that *neu* was not used before a vowel after the first decade, except twice in Book xxv.

Seu also was, in the main, subjected to similar restrictions. While *seu* was never used before a vowel by Caesar (14), Catullus (5), Tibullus (20), Propertius (25), Vergil (32), Horace (65), Seneca *Trag.* (11), Tacitus (100), Plin. *Min.* (21), and only once in Cicero (*Or.* and *Phil.*) (16), in *Verr.* 5. 152, *seu* being used here three times, and only once in Quintilian (16), 7. 2. 48: "*seu nostra seu aliena*," and Suetonius (9), *Iul.* 57 *seu sol seu imber*, Livy, on the other hand, used it before a vowel 46 times out of a total 185 times.

C. *NEVE* AND *SIVE* BEFORE A CONSONANT

Judging from the facts revealed by an examination of the latest texts of the writers of the best period, there was considerable variance in the usage of these two forms. *Atque*, it may be noted by way of comparison, in all of the nine historians examined, with the exception of Sallust, showed a decided preference for its use before a vowel.⁶ In early times, as indicated by the usage of Cato *Agr.*

¹ Kühner *Lat. Gr.* II, p. 656, is to be corrected.

² For exceptions to the rule cf. Lease *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXVIII (1907), p. 40, and add Plin. *Mai.* (M.) 30. 106. *Dein* was also used by Suetonius (*Ihm*) 18 times, but never before a vowel.

³ Cf. Niedermann-Hermann *Hist. Laut. des Lat.* (1907), § 32.

⁴ The number of times *neu*, in the latter, *seu*, is used before a consonant is placed in parentheses.

⁵ Cicero (*Or.* and *Phil.*) uses *neu* but once, *Tusc.* 1. 106, in a poetical passage.

⁶ *Atque* before a consonant is represented in Sallust by 57.4 per cent., in Caesar by 13.4 per cent., in Nepos by 19.7 per cent., in Livy, to be specially noted, by 5.4 per cent., in Vell. by 12.1 per cent., Val. Max. by 16.1 per cent., Curtius, 11.3 per cent., Tacitus, 21.2 per cent., and Suetonius, 26.3 per cent.

and Varro *R. R.*, *neve* was used oftener before a consonant than before a vowel, by the former 9 to 4, by the latter 3 to 2. *Neve* before a consonant may, therefore, be said to begin with 69.2 per cent. in Cato, 60 per cent. in Varro, but by the time of Sallust¹ we find this reduced to 40 per cent., in Cicero to 61.5 per cent., and in Caesar to 14.3 per cent. It is to be noted, however, that in two *Senatus-consulta* of the time of Caesar, the *Lex Munic.* and the *Lex. Col. Gen. Iul.*, in each of which *neve* alone is used, in keeping with the preference of the ancient usage for the longer form before a consonant, we find *neve* thus used 70.5 per cent. of the total in the former, and 72.5 per cent. in the latter. In Cicero, also, the earlier usage still prevails, i. e., *neve* is used before a consonant 24 times (= 61.5 per cent.), and 15 times before a vowel. It may be noted that Livy, who in his use of *neu* and *seu* follows Sallust rather than Cicero, by using *neve* 15 times before a consonant (42.8 per cent.), and 20 times before a vowel, in this regard also allies himself with Sallust. The later historians, Tacitus and Suetonius, also follow the earlier usage, as in the former *neve* before a consonant is represented by 66.7 per cent., in the latter by 60 per cent.

In poetry, where metrical convenience must be taken into consideration, we find two schools, the principle of division being the use of *neve* before consonants. The one is represented by Plautus (before consonant 2, vowel 9), Terence (before consonant 0, vowel 2), Vergil (before consonant 3, vowel 7), the other Horace (before consonant 3, vowel 1), Propertius (before consonant 5, vowel 2), and Ovid (before consonant 61, vowel 9). It will be noted that in none of the above is the difference so marked as in Ovid, and that here it is so great as to make it appear to be intentional and not accidental. Furthermore in Seneca *neve* is only used before a consonant.

From the point of view of a decided preference for using *sive* before a consonant, Horace stands out prominent among all the writers examined. This writer uses *sive* in this way 19 times, but only once (*Sat.* 23. 87) before a vowel. With this usage

¹ Sallust shows two examples, not one as the *Antibarbarus*, s. v., states, *neve nobis Cat.* 33.5 and *neve cum Cat.* 51. 43. The latter is used by Caesar also, *B. G.* 6. 20. 1 (K).

compare that of the following writers, where the number of times *sive* is used before a vowel in each is placed first: Caesar 13-14, Cicero (*Or.* and *Phil.*) 120-140, Livy 28-33, Quintilian 44-33, Plin. Min. 12-14, and of the poets Catullus 3-5, Propertius 15-17, Vergil 13-8, and Seneca *Trag.* 4-16.

D. USAGE BEFORE *NON*

Cicero uses *neve non* (*Lael.* 78), *sive non* (*De fato* 28-30, eight times),¹ Livy *neve non* (37. 53. 6), *neque non*² (24. 2. 4), but *atque non*, according to Schmalz *Synt.*³, §224, is found only in Plin. Mai. In this writer I have noted 18 occurrences of *atque non*. Plaut. *Trin.* 104, however, has *atque non* in G. and Sch.'s edition, as also in Lindsay's. Theoretically, such forms ought not to occur at all. Cf. p. 306 above, n. 3.

II. SYNTACTICAL

In any discussion of the use of the two particles, *neque* and *neve*, the etymology of each should not only serve as the starting-point, but be kept constantly in mind. *Nēque*, being composed of the old negative particle *nē* (cf. *nē-fas*, *nē-queo*) and the copulative conjunction, *-que*, has a force which may be represented by *et non*. *Nēve*, on the other hand, being composed of the common conjunction *nē* and the disjunctive *-ve* (cf. Sk. *vā*) has a force, which, by way of distinction, may be represented by *et nē* (originally *aut nē*). Accordingly, the fact that *non* is a word negative, *nē* a clause negative, points to the difference between *neque* and *neve*, with the result that the former is conjunctive, the latter disjunctive, and that the former throws the stress of the emphasis upon a single word, the latter upon a clause. It follows also, that, as the particular word to be negated may be a verb, *nēque* may be used where we might expect *nēve*, but not *vice versa*. The use of *neque* (= *et non*) with an imperative or subjunctive may be compared with the occasional use of *non* with these moods.

A. CO-ORDINATE CLAUSES

Inasmuch as *nē* is the regular negative of a command both with the imperative and the subjunctive, and as *nēque* does not contain

¹ Cf. also Cic. *De fin.* 2. 41 and *Quint.* 2. 4. 35.

² In Varro *L. L.* and *R. R.*, *neque non* is found 4 times, but *nec non* 10 times.

nē, but *nēve* does, the latter is the appropriate negative with these moods, and is particularly effective, owing to the reiteration of the *nē*, in peremptory prohibitions.

In Livy's use of *neque* and *neve* six things are to be noted:

1. *Neque*, rare in Cicero, once in Sallust,¹ and not at all in Caesar, is used by Livy oftener than *neve*, and forms another feature of his poetic style.² To Draeger I¹, p. 313, add: Livy 9. 9. 9; 21. 22. 6; 22. 3. 10.

2. *Neque* is used only after an affirmative, *neve* only after a negative, except in 38. 38. 8.

3. *Neque* is used nine times with the subjunctive and only twice with the imperative.

4. *Neque . . . neque* is found but once; so also *neu . . . neu*.

5. *Nec* with a deponent is used but once, 5. 53. 3.

Livy's detailed usage is as follows:

a. After a Positive

1. *Neque* with an imperative: used only twice by Livy, and in official documents, 22. 10. 5: "profanum esto *neque* scelus esto," and 38. 38. 8: "elephantos tradito omnis *neque* alios parato."

2. *Neque* (*nec*) with a subjunctive: found 9 times: with an imperfect twice, *neque*, 21. 22. 6 (in O. O.), *nec* 21. 22. 9; with a present and a second *neque* once, 22. 39. 21: "intentus sis *neque*

¹ Cf. Jug. 87. 45: "Capessite rem p. . . . *neque* quemquam . . . metus ceperit."

² For *neque* with an imperative in poetry cf. Draeger *H. S. I*², p. 328, and Blase *H. Gr. III*, p. 246. Each cites but one passage in Martial, 5. 48. 7, but here the latest texts do not have *nec*. This writer shows but 4 examples, 3. 2. 12; 4. 14. 11; 7. 93. 7; 13. 110. 1. To the 8 examples for Ovid cited by Draeger add: *Am.* 1. 8. 63; 2. 2. 26; *A. a.* 2. 335; *Rem. Am.* 221, 222; *Her.* 15. 31; *Tr.* 1. 9. 65; 2. 1. 81; *Met.* 2. 464; 5. 281; 8. 433, 550; 9. 792; 13. 839; *Fast.* 2. 67. 5; 3. 497, 829; 5. 412; 6. 291, 380 (20). All are after a positive exc. *A. a.* 2. 335. Whereas *neque* was used 28 times, *neque* was used only 12 times, all being after a positive exc. *Met.* 10. 352.

For *neque* with a subjunctive, cf. Draeger *I*¹, p. 313, Blase, p. 198. To Draeger's lists for Plautus add *Bacch.* 847, *Curc.* 27, *Pseud.* 272; for Horace *Ep.* 19. 9 and 11; neither Draeger nor Blase cite any examples from Martial (with pres.=11, with perf.=5), or from Statius. For the former cf. H. S. Lowther *Synt. of Mart.* (Diss. Univ. of Penn., 1906), and for the poets of the Silver Age, W. K. Clement *A.J.P.* XXI (1900), pp. 156 f. Blase cites Ter. *Eun.* 1080, and omits *Eun.* 77; also Prop. 1. 9. 25; Pers. 1. 7; 3. 73. To Draeger *I*, p. 313, add for Ovid: *Am.* 1. 8. 65; *A. a.* 1. 75, 135, 516, 584; 2. 111, 333; 3. 285; *Rem.* 628; *Met.* 2. 129; 8. 792; 9. 698; 13. 139, 756; 15. 18, 175; *Ibis* 273, 301, 559, 618, 627; *Pont.* 1. 4. 5; 2. 6. 14; 3. 6. 13; *F.* 1. 688, 692; 4. 63, 100, 757; 6. 778 (31). *Neve* at the beginning of a period, according to Draeger *II*², p. 695, found only in Ovid, is much more common in that writer than one would infer from his list of six occurrences. As a matter of fact this usage is found at least 36 times.

. . . . desis *neque* des," i. e. "and neither nor;" with a perfect, however, 5 times, once to introduce a parenthesis, "ego contra *nec* id mirati sitis," and 3 times to begin a sentence: "*Nec* quaesiverit," 9. 9.11; "*Nec* existimaritis," 21. 43. 11; "*Nec* egeritis" 23. 3. 3; once after a present subj., 22. 3. 10: "Hannibal perveniat *nec* nos hinc moverimus." Note the original parataxis in 44. 36. 11: "se suadere, adgrediatur *nec* amittat." (In 21. 41. 16 *nec* goes with the following *solum*.)

3. *Neve*, found only once, but in a passage containing a gap in the MSS, 38. 38. 8: "tradito *neu* plures *neve* plures habeto *neve* monerem (habeto)," i. e. "and neither nor and not."

b. After a Negative

Only *ne* *neve* used, and 9 times, once with a perfect subj., 22. 10. 5: "*ne* esto *neve* cleptum erit" (ancient formula), and 8 times with an imperative, all being in two official documents, 38. 11. 2, 6, 7; 38. 38. 2, 3, 6, 9, 15.

Note also 38. 38. 2: "ne quem transire sinito *neu* com meatu *neu* qua alia ope iuvato," i. e., "and neither nor." Cf. also B. 3. *infra*.

B. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

In final clauses *neve* is the appropriate particle to be used whenever a choice of alternatives is to be given. Where, however, the second clause is added as a continuance to the first clause, we should expect *et nē*, and failing that, *nēque*, though inaccurate, would have to serve. This usage of *ut* *neque* is rare, but common in the consecutive sentence, where *ut* *neque* = *ut* *et ut nē* = *ut* *et ut non*. In a final sense Sallust uses *ut* *neque* not at all; Cicero (*Or.* and *Phil.*) 25 times as a consecutive, and 6 times¹ as a final (19.4

¹ *Ut* *neque* final: Cicero *Verr.* 2. 41: "eum commonefacit *ut* *utatur* *nec* cogat;" 3. 18: "postularunt *ut* *adderent neque* recederent;" 3. 115: (postularunt) *ut* *praetermittam neque* eos appellem;" *Off.* 2. 73: "videndum erit ei *ut* *teneat neque* *fiat*;" *Div. Caec.* 52: "suadebit tibi *ut* *discedas neque* respondeas;" *De or.* 1. 19: "hortemur *ut* *complectantur neque* *confidant*;" Caesar *B. G.* 2. 10. 5: "persuaderi *ut* *morarentur neque* *ferrent*;" *B. C.* 3. 92. 2: "praedixerat *ut* *exciperent neque* *moverent*,"

per cent.); Caesar 11 times consecutive, twice final (15.4 per cent.); Nepos 7 times only as consecutive, but Livy 9 times consecutive and 16 times final (64 per cent.). It may be noted that in final clauses while Sallust uses *ut neve* 8 times and *ut neque* once, and Caesar *ut neve* 9 times, *ut neque* twice, Cicero and Livy use each combination almost the same number of times, 4¹-6 by the former, 14-16 by the latter. In Caesar *ut neque* is always used with two verbs; in Cicero always, except *Verr.* 3. 227; 4. 45; *Tusc.* 5. 13; and in Livy always, except 3. 58. 5.

1. *Ut neve*,² the normal form of the final clause, in Livy always with two verbs: *ut neve* (twice in Caesar *B. G.* 6. 20. 1; *B. C.* 3. 103. 4): 2. 32. 2; 4. 14. 5; 25. 28. 4; 26. 34. 7 (=4), but more commonly *ut neu*, as in Caesar (7): 2. 15. 2; 3. 44. 12; 8. 30. 2; 32. 12; 24. 30. 14; 25. 1. 12; 29. 2. 13; 32. 22. 6; 33. 46. 7; 39. 19. 4 (=10). Note also the parataxis in 3. 55. 6; 28. 36. 2; 34. 35. 5, and especially 25. 9. 4: "monuit, irent *nec* quemquam paterentur *et* essent *neu* facerent," and 26. 34. 7: "iusserunt ita ut nemo esset *neve* quis manerent."

2. *Ut neque*, the abnormal form in a final sentence, found not at all in Sallust, six times in Cicero, and but twice in Caesar, was used more freely first by Livy, i. e., *ut neque* final, in Nepos 0 per cent., in Caesar 15.4 per cent., in Cicero 19.4 per cent., but in Livy 64 per cent. Draeger II², p. 697, cites 8 examples of *ut nec* in Livy, and comments on Livy's using only the shorter form. Three of these examples should not be counted, as in 1. 2. 4 we have *nec solum*, in 1. 43. 11 the indic. in later texts, and 4. 4. 11 has *ne ne ne*. In final clauses Livy uses *ut nec* 11 times, but *ut neque* 5 times, and in consecutive clauses *ut nec* 6 times, but *ut neque* 3 times. In the two kinds, *ut nec* is found 17 times, *ut neque* 8. In final clauses *ut neque (nec) et*, etc., are found 20 times, but in consecutive clauses 16 times.

¹ *Ut neve*: Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 69; *Sest.* 101; *Phil.* 7. 8; *Off.* 3. 6.

² Draeger II², p. 695, cites two occurrences in Plautus: add *Bacch.* 648, *Trin.* 1145, each = *ut neu*, and with parataxis, *Merc.* 1021, *Most.* 403; cf. also Sall. *Cat.* 33. 5.

Final

(a) *Ut* *neque* 3. 44. 5; 7. 31. 9; 30. 12. 14, 37. 3; 32. 26. 18; (b) *ut* *nec* 3. 52. 11, 58. 5; 5. 30. 8; 6. 27. 7; 10. 20. 4; 24. 3. 14; 27. 20. 12; 31. 21. 13; 39. 10. 8; 40. 9. 5, 28. 5; (c) *ut* *neque* *et* 1. 43. 10, 44. 4; (d) *ut* *nec* *et* 1. 28. 5.

Consecutive

(a) *Ut* *neque*: 2. 11. 3; 9. 20. 8; 36. 16. 11; (b) *ut* *nec* 2. 9. 8; 8. 36. 7; 27. 8. 6; 34. 18. 2, 22. 4; 38. 51. 12; (c) *ut* *neque* *et* 26. 48. 3; *ut* *nec* *et* 5. 51. 1; 10. 20. 7; (d) *ut* *nec modo* *sed etiam* 1. 2. 4, and *ut* *nec* *modo* *sed ne* *quidem*, 26. 2. 11.

In all of the above examples two verbs are used, except in 3. 58. 5: "*ut* *sui misererentur nec gentis*."

3. "*Ut* *neve* *neve*," "that neither nor," is extremely rare. Two of the passages cited by Draeger II², p. 695, Cic. *Sest.* 65, Caes. *B. G.*, are removed from this category by the latest texts or by the sense, i. e., *neu*=*et ne*. Both Draeger and Schmalz, *Synt.*³, p. 358, say that this usage is found but once in Livy, 30. 37. 4 (= *ut*) *neve* *neve*. With an additional *neu*, however, another passage is found, 25. 38. 5: "Scipiones me ambo excitant *neu* se *neu* milites *neu* rem publicam patiar inultam." It is to be noted that in all the passages that have been cited none is found with *two verbs*, such a use, according to Bennett *Critique Rec. Subj. Theories*, p. 29, having never been developed. I have noticed but two: Hor. *Sat.* 2. 5. 89: "*neu* desis *neve* abundes," and (with same verb repeated) Sen. *Ep.* 7. 8: "*neve* similis malis fias *neve* inimicus multis."

4. *Ut neque* *neque*: a formula used much less freely (15.6 per cent.) in a final sentence than the simple *ut* *neque* (64 per cent.): *Final*: 4. 11. 4; 5. 11. 9; 22. 12. 8; 35. 25. 8; 44. 46. 7 (4. 11. 4; 22. 12. 8 being with two verbs); *Consecutive*, *ut nec* *nec*: 2. 21. 4, 26. 5; 5. 6. 8; 41. 20. 2; 43. 3; 10. 18. 6; 21. 14; 26. 1; 21. 12. 1; 23. 4. 5; 25. 36. 5; 26. 36. 11;

28. 4. 3, 12. 4; 33. 32. 10; 45. 25. 4 (=16); *ut neque* *neque*, 2. 50. 6, 59. 7; 8. 7. 21, 13. 2; 33. 5. 10, 12 (=6); *ut neque* *nec* 21. 35. 12; 22. 61. 13; 33. 7. 2 (=3); *ut nec* *neque* 22. 28. 14; 40. 9. 4 (=2). All have only one verb, except 45. 25. 4.

Note also *ut* *neque* (*ter*) 8. 38. 10; *ut* *nec* (*ter*) 34. 38. 7 and *ut* *nec* (4 times) 43. 10. 3.

5. *Ne* *neve*: the normal form is found in Livy 31 times:¹ 1. 52. 6; 3. 17. 12, 30. 5; 4. 30. 13; 8. 34. 6; 21. 40. 5; 23. 7. 4; 25. 14. 2; 26. 1. 10; 27. 38. 6; 30. 37. 6; 33. 30. 6; 38. 4. 6, 29. 8; 39. 19. 4; 40. 44. 10; 45. 25. 9 (=17) and *ne quis* *neve* 2. 24. 6; 4. 30. 11; 7. 14. 2; 23. 2. 10, 7. 1, 34. 9; 26. 28. 13; 34. 35. 9, 11; 36. 3. 3; 39. 14. 8, 17. 3, 18. 8; 41. 8. 12 (=14). Of the above *ne* *neve* = 21, *ne* *neu* = 10 (in Caesar *ne* *neve* = 3, *ne* *neu* = 10).

6. *Ne* *neque* is an abnormal form of expression and very rare. According to the *Antibarbarus*² II, p. 133, it is not found in Cicero, Caesar, or Sallust, but in Nepos. The nearest approach to an exception in Cicero is *Verr.* 4. 60: "egerit *ne* *fuisse videatur neque* se *instruxisse et ornasse*," and similarly in *Fin.* 4. 10; in Caesar *B. G.* 7. 75. 1: *ne* *nec* *nec*. Nepos, cited also by Draeger II², p. 697, has, however, in the only possible passage, 4. 4. 6, been changed to *ne* *neu* in Fleckeisen's edition (a change already suggested by Zumpt *Lat. Gr.*, § 535). *Ne* *neque* is found, however, in poetry from Plautus and Terence on. *Ne* *nec*, Livy 4. 4. 11, cited by Draeger and by Kühner II, p. 146, has *ne* *ne* *ne* *ne* in the latest texts. (In 5. 33. 11 *nec* = *ne* *quidem*.) There, therefore, remain but 4 occurrences of *ne* *nec* (*neque* not used) in Livy: 3. 21. 6; 5. 3. 8; 26. 42. 2; 40. 46. 4.

7. *Ne* *neu* *neu*, found only once in Cicero and twice in Livy, but not with a correlative force, 29. 24. 3: "monet eum *ne* iura secum *neu* cum p. R. . . . *neu* fas *fallat*;" 34. 1. 3: "tulerat legem *ne* qua *plus haberet neu* vestimento *uteretur neu* vehiculo *veheretur*."

¹ Draeger II², p. 695, cites only 4 passages in Plautus and cites *Merc.* 322 for 332. As a matter of fact he uses *ne* *neu* 15 times, *ne* *neve* 7 times, and *neu* with parataxis *Merc.* 1021; *Most.* 403.

Note also "*ne neu neu neu*" 8. 32. 4; "*ne neve et ne*" 43. 2. 12; "*ne ne neve*" 7. 14. 2; "*ne neve non solum sed etiam ne*" 37. 53. 6; "*ne Veientium neu Sabinorum esset et adessent.*"

8. *Ne nec nec* (*neque* not used by Livy) is found twice: 2. 32. 10: "*conspirasse ne manus ferrent nec os acciperet nec dentes conficerent,*" and 5. 7. 4: "*metum incit ne nec in urbe nec in castris posset.*"

C. NE AUT AUT

This form of a final clause should also be taken into consideration. According to the *Antibarbarus*⁷ II, p. 145, *ne aut aut* is more frequent than *ut neve neve* or *ne neve neve*. The reason for this is that *ne aut aut* gives the key to the clause, showing its character at the start, while *ut neve neve* is more artificial.

The results here given show that in Livy *ne aut aut* is found eight times as often as the other two combined.

a) With two verbs, *ne* (alone): 24. 29. 6; 25. 11. 2; 27. 4. 2; 29. 27. 11; 32. 22. 3; 34. 34. 5; 35. 29. 9; 37. 52. 7, 54. 9; 40. 14. 7; 42. 33. 5 (=11); *ne quis* 24. 9. 10; 38. 38. 16.

b) With two nouns, *ne* (alone): 4. 58. 12; 5. 20. 2; 8. 29. 3; 22. 49. 11; 27. 26. 8, 30. 10; 28. 25. 8 (=7); *ne quid* 30. 12. 20; *necubi* 22. 28. 8.

c) With two prepositional phrases 27. 48. 8, and 31. 11. 14. (Total=24.)

SUMMARY

Livy's attitude toward the shorter form of these particles is represented by the following proportions: *neu* by 57.9 per cent., *seu* by 75.2 per cent., *ac* by 63.4 per cent., *nec* (in first two books of each decade) by 71.5 per cent., and *dein* by 15 per cent.

I. CO-ORDINATE CLAUSES

A. After a Positive:

{	<i>neque</i>	with imperative=2	}	=11
		with subjunctive=2		
	<i>nec</i>	with subjunctive=7		
		with imperative=1		

B. After a *Negative*:

<i>ne</i> <i>neve</i>	{ with subjunctive = 1	} = 3
	with imperative = 2	
<i>ne</i> <i>neu</i>	with imperative = 6	= 6

II. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

- A. *ut* *neve* = 4 } = 14
ut *neu* = 10 }
ut *neque* (final) = 5 } = 16
ut *nec* (final) = 11 } = 25
ut *neque* (consecutive) = 3 } = 9
ut *nec* (consecutive) = 6 }
ut *neque* (*nec*) *et*, etc. (final) = 20
ut *neque* (*nec*) *et*, etc. (consecutive) = 15
ut neve *neve* = 1
ut neque *neque* (final) = 2 } = 5
ut nec *nec* (final) = 3 }
ut neque *neque* (consecutive) = 6 }
ut nec *nec* (consecutive) = 16 } = 27
ut neque *nec* (consecutive) = 3 }
ut nec *neque* (consecutive) = 2 }
- B. *ne* *neve* = 21 } = 31
ne *neu* = 10 }
ne *neve* *neve* = 0
ne *neu* *neu* = 2
ne *neque* = 0
ne *nec* = 4
ne *neque* *neque* = 0
ne *nec* *nec* = 2
ne *aut* *aut* = 24

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

THE CHRONOLOGY OF EARLY ROME

By HENRY A. SANDERS

It has come to be second nature with most of us to date the founding of Rome in 753 B. C., and the first year of the Republic in 509 B. C. We recognize, to be sure, that much of the early history is mythical, but to what extent and in what manner that may affect the dates is seldom considered.

How erroneous it is blindly to fasten these dates upon all Roman writers and to interpret their years *ab urbe condita* after this generally accepted era, I have shown, taking Livy as an example, in a couple of notes in the *Classical Journal* I, p. 156; II, p. 82. But to discuss the whole subject and even to attempt to distinguish between the historical and the mythical in the chronology of early Rome is to venture on much more dangerous ground. Already in 1855 Sir George Cornewall Lewis in his *Inquiry into the Credibility of Early Roman History*, II, p. 556, came to the conclusion that, "All historical labor bestowed on the early centuries of Rome will, in general, be wasted." Succeeding historians have reaffirmed or even strengthened this assertion, and the failure of many attempted chronologies of Rome illustrate it. Most radical of all is doubtless Pais *Storia di Roma* and *Ancient Legends of Roman History*, who absolutely rejects all the legends as well as the chronology.

The time of the founding of Rome was, both to Greeks and Romans, a matter of pure guesswork. Its date according to the Varronian Era, now interpreted as 753 B. C., was merely one of many guesses, and was not universally adopted till much later. Under these circumstances it is apparent that the determination of this mythical date is as impossible for us as it was for the ancients. But the Romans made use of later dates in trying to approximate to the time of the founding, and this date, when once established by any author, had, in turn, a paramount influence on his manner of stating later dates. It is for the light that may

be thrown on these later dates and their historical basis, that I have attempted this investigation.

I. In the first class I place those myths which refer to a time before the destruction of Troy or which, though timeless, manifestly imply a very ancient origin:

1) Antiochus of Syracuse (424 B. C.)¹ wrote that "Sicelus, an exile from Rome, came to the Oenotrians before the emigration of a portion of them to Sicily" (Dion. Hal. i. 73. 4).

2) Antigonus, in the *Historia Italica* (200 B. C.), said that "Rhomus, sprung from Jupiter, founded a city on the Palatine, and gave his name to it" (Festus, p. 266 M).

3) Festus, p. 266 M, cites from a *Historia Cumana* that "colonists from Athens, Sicyon, and Thespieae, called Aborigines from their wanderings, first settled on the Palatine and called their city Valentia, a name which was changed to Rhome on the arrival of Evander, Aeneas, and many Greek-speaking followers" (Servius ad *Aen.* i. 273 refers this to [L.] Ateius [*Praetextatus*]).

4) Plutarch *Rom.* 1 states on unknown authority that "the Pelasgians founded the city and called it Rhome from their strength."

5) Plutarch *Rom.* 2 names Rome, daughter of Italus and Lucaria, the founder (cf. Syncellus I, p. 363 in *Corp. Scrip. Hist. Byz.*).

6) Dionysius of Halicarnassus i. 72. 6 and Plutarch *Rom.* 2 had found the statement that Rome was founded and named by an ancient Latin hero, Romis or Romus, son of Italus.

II. In the second class I place those myths, which make the founding of Rome the direct result of the capture of Troy:

1) Heraclides Lembus (150 B. C.) wrote that "Greeks, returning from Troy, were driven to the Tiber by a storm and settled there, when a captive girl named Rhome set fire to their ships. The city prospered and was named Rome in honor of the girl" (Festus, p. 269 M, Solinus i. 2, Servius ad *Aen.* i. 273).

2) Aristotle († 322 B. C.) gives the same without naming Rome (Dion. Hal. i. 72. 3).

3) Plutarch *Rom.* 1 applies this story to wandering Trojans.

¹ Only those authors are dated whose time seems reasonably certain.

4) The writer, probably Hellanicus, of the *History of the Priestesses of Argos* (400 B. C.) combined the two versions, making Ulysses and Aeneas the leaders of the expedition. Cf. also Damastes of Sigeum (400 B. C.) for the same (Dion. Hal. i. 72. 2).

5) Clinias related that "Rome, daughter of Telemachus, married Aeneas and gave her name to the city" (Servius ad *Aen.* i. 273, cf. Plutarch *Rom.* 2).

6) Cephalon of Gergithes (200 B. C.) wrote that "Aeneas founded Rome and named it from a companion" (Festus, p. 266).

7) Sallust *Cat.* 6 claimed to have heard an old story that "Aeneas with Trojans and Aborigines founded Rome" (cf. Dion. Hal. i. 72. 1).

III. In the third class I place those writers who had Rome founded by a descendant of Aeneas or other Trojan in the second or third generation after Troy. The variations are so slight, I merely enumerate authorities:

1) Dionysius of Chalceis (250 B. C.); cf. Dion. Hal. i. 72. 6.

2) Demagoras, Agathyllus, and Cephalon of Gergithes (200 B. C.); cf. Dion. Hal. i. 72. 1; Syncellus i. 363.

3) Eratosthenes (195 B. C.); cf. Servius ad *Aen.* i. 273.

4) Alcimus in the *Italica*; cf. Festus, p. 266.

5) Agathocles of Cyzicus (250 B. C.), two versions; cf. Festus, p. 269; Solinus i. 3.

6) Apollodorus in *Euxenide* (250 B. C.); cf. Festus, p. 266.

7) Naevius, Ennius, and other Romans; cf. Servius ad *Aen.* i. 273; vi. 777; Dion. Hal. i. 73. 2.

8) Callias (300 B. C.) made Romulus the son of Rome, a Trojan woman, and of Latinus; cf. Dion. Hal. i. 72. 5; Festus, p. 269; Syncellus i. 363.

9) Plutarch *Rom.* 2 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus i. 73 have several other versions making a son of Aeneas the founder; cf. also *Etymologicon Magnum* s. v. *Ῥώμη*.

IV. In the fourth class I place the myths, which represent Rome as founded by a descendant of Ulysses or some other Greek, and in the second or third generation after Troy. The forms vary little. The authorities are as follows:

1) Xenagoras; cf. Dion. Hal. i. 72. 5; Stephanus Byz. s. v. "Avreia and 'Αρδέα.

2) Clinias; cf. Festus, p. 269; Servius ad *Aen.* i. 273; Plutarch *Rom.* 2.

3) An unknown author in Plutarch *Rom.* i.

4) An unknown author in Servius ad *Aen.* i. 273.

V. In the fifth class belong the myths, which make Rome a colony of Alba Longa. The only important variations are as to dates, which I will give with authorities:

1) Timaeus (300 B. C.) dates Rome in the thirty-eighth year before the first Olympiad = 814 B. C.,¹ contemporaneous with Carthage; cf. Dion. Hal. i. 74. 1.

2) The date Olympiad 1, 1, = 776 B. C. is also found; cf. Syncellus 1. 365, who cites Laas (= Kallias?) and also wrongly Timaeus for this date.

3) Q. Fabius Pictor (190 B. C.), in Olympiad 8, 1 = 748 B. C.; cf. Dion. Hal. i. 74. 1; Solinus i. 27.

4) L. Cincius Alimentus (190 B. C.), in Olympiad 12, 4 = 729 B. C.; cf. Dion. Hal. i. 74. 1; Solinus i. 27.

5) Eratosthenes (195 B. C.), Apollodorus (143 B. C.), Lutatius (100 B. C.), Nepos (cf. Solinus i. 27), Polybius (cf. Dion. Hal. i. 74. 3), Cicero *De re pub.* ii. 10, in Olympiad 7, 2 = 751 or 750 B. C.

6) Cato (170 B. C.) places date 432 years after Troy = 752 (751) B. C.;² cf. Dion. Hal. i. 74. 2; also Eusebius, a. Abr. 1264 = Olym. 7, 1.

7) Eusebius a. Abr. 1263 gives Olympiad 6, 4 = 753 or 752 B. C.

8) Syncellus i. 361 gives Olympiad 7, 4 = 749 B. C.

9) Tarutius, Atticus, Varro give Olympiad 6, 3 = 753 B. C.;³ cf. Censorinus *De die natali* 21. 5; Solinus i. 27.

¹ Trieber *Hermes* XXVII, p. 334, shows that 814 not 813 B. C. is the right interpretation.

² Cf. *ibid.*; the discussion in Dionysius shows that 752 not 751 B. C. is meant.

³ The question whether the comparative or actual Olympiad year was given in the various historians is a perplexing one. The Olympiad year was from July to July. The founding of Rome occurred traditionally on April 21. Thus the Olympiad years and the years A. U. C. coincided during ten months, and it was natural in dating Roman events to give the comparative Olympiad year. Therefore, if such Olympiad dates be

We may now sum up the results of our classification and so eliminate worthless material. Of the five classes of foundation myths, the second, third, and fourth are plainly under the influence of the Homeric tradition, and so can teach us only that, when the western Greeks became curious about the origin of Rome, the influence of the Homeric poems was the chief literary one among them. The origin through Greek heroes seems to have been at least as early as the story of the Trojan origin, and the two myths were very early combined. Furthermore there was during that period no widely known native myth concerning Rome's foundation, though its origin confessedly antedated tradition.

The myths of the first class indicate the same condition in even stronger terms. To be exact, from the fifth century B. C. on, the western Greeks had no definite knowledge regarding the date of Rome, though they thought of it as antedating the earliest of their own colonies, some of which belonged to the eighth century. It is a fair assumption, therefore, that Rome was older than the traditional date (753 B. C.) rather than younger, a conclusion confirmed by prehistoric graves found within the limits of the city. It remains for us to consider the myth which interposed the Alban kings between Troy and Rome. This was generally combined with dates ranging from 814 to 729 B. C. Not only is it younger than the other classes of myths, but it appears regularly as a combined Trojan-Alban myth. It is possible, though not probable, that a popular myth once existed at Rome, independent of the Trojan myth and stating merely that Rome was a colony of Alba; but it seems more likely that the growth of the Trojan myth, when its chronological discrepancies had been noted, was guided or influenced by the few public rites and customs, pointing to a former religious or political supremacy of Alba and Lavinium.

Such being the case it is evident, as Mommsen *Röm. Chron.*, pp. 152-54, has pointed out, that these dates are pure combina-

interpreted exactly, they would be one year late for events between April 21 and July 1; cf. Mommsen *Röm. Chron.*, p. 135, n. Yet when we come to the later and more exact writers, there were doubtless many cases of correct dating. The earlier historians and the Greeks regularly used the comparative date; thus in Fabius Pictor Olym. 8, 1 = 748 not 747 B. C. On the other hand there can be no doubt that in the exact reckonings of the astrologer Tarutius and of Varro Olym. 6, 3 = 753 not 754 B. C.

tions, either being reckoned after the fall of Troy or back from the establishment of the republic. As regards fixing even an approximate date for the founding these dates are absolutely worthless, but they do prove the presence of the line of Alban kings in the traditional history of Rome long before the time of Sulla, when Mommsen *Röm. Chron.*, p. 156, claimed that they first appeared.¹

It is certain that the earliest lists of Alban kings did not give the number of years of each reign, but the length of the whole period could, nevertheless, be determined by the regular method of the early chronologists of reckoning three generations to the century. Yet Livy i. 3, gives 15 Alban kings (= 14 generations) besides Aeneas, a period far too long to agree with the accepted eras of Troy and Rome, though it agrees fairly well with the date of Troy's fall according to Timaeus and Clitarchus, viz., 1234 B. C.; cf. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 139. The 484 intervening years allow for 14 generations with an ample balance for Aeneas and Numitor.

Diodorus vii. 3 a, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus i. 70 ff. also give 15 kings besides Aeneas, though only 13 generations. The lengths of the individual reigns are given shortened to agree with the accepted eras.

It is manifest that these lists do not represent the original form; an older one must have given just 13 generations from Troy to Rome: $1183 - 750 = 433 = 13 \times 33\frac{1}{3}$. It is true that we can reduce the 16 names of Diodorus and Dionysius to 13 generations by omitting Aeneas, since Ascanius was born at Troy, and also omitting one each from the pairs of brothers Remulus and Agrippa,² Amulius and Numitor. Such additions and interpretations can hardly have appeared in the original list, in which the number of kings and generations doubtless agreed. Thus in Ovid *Fasti* iv. 41 ff. there are but 13 kings besides Aeneas³ and in the *Metamorphoses* xiv. 609 ff.⁴ only 13 including Aeneas. The same

¹Trieber *Hermes* XXIX, p. 124 agrees that their names were not older than Alexander Polyhistor (80 B. C.).

²Or Ascanius and Silvius.

³Cf. also Servius ad *Aen.* vi. 767, that Numitor was the thirteenth Alban king.

⁴The name Alba is commonly corrected into the text, making 14.

number appears also in Appian *Bas.* i. 1. Both the interval of 433 years and the 13 kings between Troy and Rome must have been quite commonly accepted.

In Timaeus the period was 420 years, for he placed the founding of Rome in 814 B. C., while the correct interpretation of Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 139, refers the date 1234 B. C.¹ for Troy's fall to Timaeus. But 420 years allows for 12 generations and 20 years to spare, a period that can be covered by giving 10 years to the wanderings (cf. Ulysses) and 8 to the rule of Aeneas, as in the late writer Thrasyllus, and placing the founding of Rome in the second year of Numitor. The period of 420 years between Troy and Rome according to Timaeus makes it certain that he admitted the rule of Alban kings, probably 12 in number. There must also have been a shorter list of Alban kings to agree with the 300 years' rule according to Virgil *Aen.* i. 272 ff. and Justinus xliii. 1. 13. This presupposes a list of 9 Alban kings, which can be obtained from Cassius Dio, frg. 4 (Zonaras 7. 1) by excluding both Aeneas and Numitor. It is possible that this represents an ancient form of the myth, as Trieber *Hermes* XXIX, p. 125, and Pais *Storia di Roma* II. i, p. 187, suppose, but it is quite as likely that both the 9 kings and the 300 years represent a late adaptation to the magic number three.

It is hardly necessary to discuss the relation of the other dates of Troy and Rome. As Timaeus, who dated Rome the earliest of those giving definite dates, plainly allows for the period of Alban kings, the other early historians, both Greek and Roman, must have done the same, as soon as they attempted to give dates to the

¹Unger *Hermes* XXXV, p. 24, and Trieber *Hermes* XXVII, p. 332, make the date of Troy 1334 B. C., according to Timaeus. They seem to have been led astray by the incomplete citation of the passage in Müller *F. H. G.* The absurdity of this reckoning is evident from the fact, that, if they interpreted the whole sentence of Clemens in the same fashion, they would find that Troy fell in 1287 B. C., according to Eratosthenes instead of 1183 B. C., the accepted date, based on another passage in the same chapter of Clemens. Besides, Clemens assigns the date 1334 B. C. for the fall of Troy to Duris only a few lines farther on. Censorinus *De die nat.* 21. 3 cites Timaeus for the fall of Troy in 1193 B. C., but this is certainly due either to an interchange of names or an omission. This is the date given by Thrasyllus; cf. Clemens *Strom.* i. 21. 137. Mommsen *Röm. Chron.*, p. 136, erred in the other direction by assuming that Timaeus (frg. 23 Müller) represented Aeneas as contemporary with Dido. The fragment in question leaves no place for Aeneas in the myth of Dido, who kills herself to escape marriage with Iarbas.

period. This renders it fairly certain that, from the fourth century on, the Alban kings had a place in the history of Rome. Pais *op. cit.* I. i, pp. 201 and 224, holds that the Alban myth arose soon after the subjugation of Latium (340-338 B. C.) and from political reasons. As regards the time of origin he must be about right, but both the chronology and the presence of the Greek names in the list indicate a Greek origin rather than a native Latin one.

Far more frequently the traditional seven kings of Rome were used to date the city, by reckoning back from the establishment of the Republic. Mommsen *Röm. Chron.*, pp. 134 f., has explained the variations in the dates of the founding by a very free use of the interregnum year after Romulus, which he made into two years and twice added to the reign of Numa, though still retaining it as an interregnum year, a rather forced explanation even though the length of Numa's reign is variously given as 39, 41, or 43 years.¹ Mommsen thus reached the conclusion that the different dates of founding were due merely to varying lengths of royal rule and pointed to a single accepted date for the establishment of the Republic. He took no account of such divergent dates as those of Cincius Alimentus, whom he considered an antiquarian of the Augustan age, or of Timaeus or Ennius. Moreover, the inference which he drew from this and from a similar reduction to unity of the many apparent variations in the consular lists, as given in the *Fasti* and in the various historians, has been fatal to progress in investigations into the chronology of Rome. Briefly stated, his position is (*op. cit.*, p. 133) that "the various *Fasti* and historians show practically the same numbers and names of consuls for the Republic, thus pointing to the existence before the literary period of a single, well-established tradition, an officially corrected edition of the *Fasti*; but instead of the historical trustworthiness of the lists and dates being assured thereby, in fact these would be much more certain, if there were two or more original versions, now agreeing, now disagreeing."

The unanimity discovered by Mommsen seemed to him to prove that all divergent forms and dates had been corrected and unified

¹ Unger *Rh. Mus.* XXXV, p. 11, sees the fallacy of this explanation, but his own method of inserting interregnum years after four of the kings is even worse.

in the pontifical tablets before the literary period. In other words, the pontiffs possessed a single, authoritative consular list, couched in literary form and accommodated to the prevalent chronological ideas, even before the time of Fabius. With the exception of Pais *op. cit.*, p 226,¹ who goes to the other extreme by refusing all credence to the early consular lists because of their divergences and inconsistencies, this view of Mommsen's has in general been held down to the present, notably by Unger *op. cit.*, though the facts he gathered were against it. Yet this interpretation demands that the seven kings of Rome be reckoned in round numbers at 240 years, even in the earliest version, instead of at the natural three per century; neither does it explain all the different founding dates, and, as above stated, sadly overworks the interregnum year after Romulus. Not only must we explain the increase in the regal period from 233 to 240 years, but we cannot lightly deny authority to 729 B. C. as the date of founding according to Cincius Alimentus. Dionysius surely knew whether he was using a historian or a contemporary antiquarian, so that this date must also be explained.²

In spite of the length of time it has stood, the theory of Mommsen rests on a most insecure footing. Yet on this hangs all the learned investigation, reaching down to the present, which has attempted to reconstruct and date the literary version, or collection of extracts of the pontifical tablets, supposed to be the only original source of all the early annalists.

That there are variations in the Roman consular lists is unquestioned (cf. *CIL* I, *Fasti consulares*). Mommsen even did not try to correct them out of the texts, but rather belittled them and asserted that they were of late origin. So far is this from being true, that the discrepancies are both decided and numerous, and go back to the earliest sources. And besides, instead of having arisen through careless omissions, judging from internal evidence, the briefest list seems to be the oldest and most trustworthy.

Let us turn our attention first to Livy. As I pointed out in the *Classical Journal* I, p. 156, he omits the four dictatorial years,

¹ Cf. *Anc. Leg. of Rom. Hist.*, pp. 6 ff.

² Thus Unger *op. cit.*, p. 25.

421, 430, 445, 453 A.U.C., three consular years, 247, 264, and 265 A.U.C., and one military tribune year, 378 A.U.C., a total of eight. That should have given him the year 501 B. C. for the founding of the Republic, and doubtless one of his sources had that date, though Livy himself reckons in his chronology four of the years he, in fact, omits, and besides adds an extra decemviral year, so as to arrive at 506 B. C. for the establishment of the Republic. It seems clear that, of the sources of Livy, one, which we may style C, omitted eight years from the full consular Fasti, while another, which I call D, omitted four. It is not determinable which, if either, of these sources inserted the extra decemviral year.

But this is not the worst. Even the above-mentioned more abbreviated consular list was somewhat padded. If we turn to Livy vi. 35. 10, we learn that owing to dissensions between plebeians and patricians, there were no curule magistrates for five successive years. This statement is on its face suspicious, yes impossible. Now turning to Diodorus xv. 75, who regularly represents an earlier source than Livy, we find that the period of anarchy is confined to a single year.¹ Furthermore, Diodorus omits the four decemviral years as does Livy (one falls in a lacuna) and likewise one military tribune year, 387 A. U. C.; this is not the same one as in Livy, but it falls in the same period, so that the chronological balance was preserved. The omissions of Livy or an equivalent all occur in Diodorus and more besides. So we have a right to assume that Diodorus omitted the three consular years, 247, 264, 265 A.U.C., which fall in a lacuna. This is all the more certain as Diodorus also omits the year 272 A.U.C., making here also a group of four years omitted.

This makes a total of 13 years omitted by Diodorus. Nor is this all; between books xii and xiii he omits five years, 331 to 335 A. U. C. inclusive, though he later reinserts five years by repeating

¹Mommsen *Hermes* XIII, pp. 306 and 553, refers the one year of anarchy to Polybius and Fabius, holding that the four years as also the four decemviral years were inserted to make up for omitted interregna, etc. Unger *Bayer. Akad.* XV (1879), pp. 88 ff., has overthrown this view by showing that if much time was lost at the beginning of the year through interregna, the consular year was so much shorter. The slight variations in the length of the consular years owing to priestly influence on the calendar, abdications, dictatorships overrunning the consular years, interregna, etc., have had no effect that can be reckoned.

xv. 2—xv. 20, the five years just given in the passage xiv. 97 to xiv. 110. These five sets of names are plainly from different sources in the two passages, as almost all the names in the second set differ somewhat in form from the first set. It is also noteworthy, that the Roman events are joined to the first set, leaving the second set without Roman historical allusions. The conclusion is unavoidable, that the Roman chronology of Diodorus was influenced by two sources. The one, which we may style Source A, omitted 18 years from the most complete Fasti, the other, Source B, omitted 13.

What cause can there have been for such extensive omissions or insertions? We may note first, that the military tribune year, 378 A.U.C., omitted by Livy and his sources, was the year before the period of anarchy, while the military tribune year, 387 A.U.C., omitted by Diodorus and his sources, was the last one in the same group of military tribune years. The conclusion is obvious; not even the one year of anarchy according to Diodorus was in the original consular lists, but was manufactured out of some reference to a brief period of anarchy, and when it became a full year, it crowded out a military tribune year near it, so as to keep in accord with accepted chronology. That we find two separate years omitted in the different sources proves that two independent authors corrected the list to agree with the accepted chronology.

The omission of five successive years in Source A of Diodorus seems to have been later than this and to have been arbitrarily made to balance a previous insertion of the five anarchy years.

Source C of Livy is closely related to Source B of Diodorus, having inserted merely one consular and four anarchy years additional. The two must be referred back to a common source, as X, which lacked four consular years between 247 and 272 A.U.C., the whole five years of anarchy, and the four decemviral years. We have just shown how the one anarchy year crept in by crowding out a military tribune year. In like manner this one year of anarchy must have grown to five from chronological reasons, viz., to keep pace chronologically with some other consular list which had inserted the four extra-consular years or the four extra-decemviral years.

Let us see if we can determine the age and author of any of these sources or consular lists. For Sources X and B the date of establishment of the Republic was $509 - 13 = 496$ B. C.¹ I have noted above that the seven kings must originally have been reckoned at $33\frac{1}{2}$ years each, or at a total of 233 years. Now a historian, who was earnest and exact enough to search out a consular list containing the least number of interpolations, would surely have reckoned the seven traditional kings as seven generations at a total of 233 years, and not accepted the pure inventions, which gave a definite length to each reign.

If, however, we add these 233 royal years to 496 B. C. of Sources X and B, we get 729 B. C. for the founding of the city, precisely the date given by Cincius Alimentus,² which Mommsen tried to call in question. Cincius was, therefore, either Source B or X. We have also the right to infer that Cincius and his sources mentioned the Alban kings, for the 420 years between 729 B. C. and 1149 B. C., the date of Troy's fall according to Ephorus (Clemens *Strom.* i. 21. 139), is the same as Timaeus and Thrasylus gave to the Alban period.

This whole chronology is so simple and honest, that the question may well be asked, why Fabius Pictor and all his followers gave a different one. The answer cannot be doubtful. The variations in the consular list, the changes, interpolations, and chronological adjustments go back to the pontifical and other lists, even before the time of Fabius. The variations in these current lists, extracted from priestly or official sources, by comparison brought about the increase of the regal period from 233 to 240 and perhaps to 244 years, in an attempt to preserve approximately some accepted date for the founding. Now in a partial list of the kings, Cicero *De re pub.* ii. 10 ff., indicates a total of 238 years for royal rule, though he expressly states a total of 240 years, probably by including a two-year interregnum after Romulus; cf. Mommsen *Röm. Chron.*, p. 138. We should therefore accept

¹ Unger *Rh. Mus.* XXXV, p. 2, by a different reckoning gets 498 B. C. as the true date.

² The adjusting of later dates, as the capture of Rome by the Gauls, to this chronology of Cincius presents some interesting results, which I must, however, reserve for another paper.

238 years as the second stage in the increase of the regal period. But we have seen that Sources A and B differed from each other by five years, as also Sources B and C. Then Source A must have placed the establishment of the Republic in 491 B. C., i. e., 509-18; but if that author gave 729 B. C. as the founding date, he would have 238 years in the regal period.

Source C implies the establishment of the Republic in 501 B. C. (509-8), Source D in 505 B. C., but none of these can be definitely connected with the briefer period of royal rule and the customary dates of founding. Yet they may well have had some influence on the growth of the regal period. Thus $505 + 243 = 748$ B. C., an accepted date for the founding and a common era for the kings.

After a regal period of 238 years had been obtained, the next inventions were the interregnum year and two years after Romulus (100 senators at five days each gives 500 days), thus giving 239 and 240 years respectively; these two were in turn increased by four years each (to 243 and 244) by a confusion arising out of the use or omission of one of the groups of four interpolated years.

It is hardly worth while to show how all the dates of founding grew out of this confusion. The important fact is that the confusion in the consular list and in the regal period existed before 200 B. C. and had not been entirely eradicated in the Augustan Age.

We may also surmise that not even the tradition of seven kings was always unquestioned. Remus at times seems more important than Romulus and Tatius is made a ruler with Romulus, if not alone. Doubtless by inserting one or the other of these, Laas (Kallias?) secured eight kings, so as to agree with the founding in the first Olympiad¹: $8 \times 33\frac{1}{3} = 267$, and $267 + 509 = 776$ B. C., i. e., Olym. 1, 1. Timaeus, however, must have inserted both extra kings, making a total of nine, and padded the consular list by an extra four years in order to agree with the founding date 814 B. C., for 510 B. C. seems the earliest date for the Republic indicated elsewhere.²

To sum up, I find that there were two or more consular lists

¹ Cf. p. 319 above.

² Another possibility for Timaeus is eight kings at 40 years, i. e., 320 years; for $814 - 320 = 494$, a reasonable date for the founding of the Republic.

existent in Rome long before 200 B. C. One at least of these seems to have been interpolated early, perhaps before 300 B. C.; cf. Timaeus and Kallias. It cannot be due to chance that these interpolations in the different Fasti seem to go mostly by fours. Doubtless the first four, the consuls 247, 264, 265, and 272 A. U. C., were introduced through family influence or carelessness, but the other insertions were mostly due to the existence of two or more varying lists, mutually influencing each other. This is the natural explanation for the introduction of the four dictatorial years and for the increase of the period of anarchy from one to five years.

According to the above we may date the establishment of the Republic in Rome between 510 and 491 B. C., or more exactly, as some of the interpolations and omissions seem certain, between 500 and 496 B. C. with the preference for the later date.

Cincius, who requires the date 496 B. C., must have used a different consular list from Fabius, whose list had to reach back to 508 or 509 B. C. in order to get 748 B. C. for the founding, as he seems to have assigned but 239¹ or 240 years to the kings. Polybius iii. 22, as also Cato and the Fasti, gave 243 years to the regal period, hence 509 B. C. for the Republic.

We know that Polybius used the pontifical tablets to determine the date of Rome (cf. Dion. Hal. i. 74. 3); therefore both Cato and Fabius, who require the same date for the Republic, used them also. Cincius surely had a different source, perhaps the *libri lintei*; but there may well have been, and probably were, other priestly or official Fasti, as well as numerous consular lists extracted from these and in the hands of the public.² Furthermore, the confusion in the lists would arise more easily if there were several to influence each other, than if there were only two. There were, doubtless, consular lists current pointing toward many of the dates from 514 to 491 B. C. for the establishment of the Republic.

In conclusion let me emphasize once more, that the proof that there were parallel Roman consular lists as early as the third or fourth century B. C. is the strongest proof of the general accuracy and historical reliability of that list.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

¹Cf. Unger *Rh. Mus.* XXXV, p. 4.

²Cf. Dion. Hal. i. 73. 1, 74. 5; Livy iv. 7. 10.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

VARIA

I

Alciphron ii. 7. 2. (Schepers). πέπανσο, Κέκροψ ἄθλιε, καὶ τρέπου κατὰ σεαντόν, ὦ πρέσβυ, μὴ σε λαβοῦσα κακὸν τι ἐργάσωμαι.

The words are addressed by a girl to a decrepit wooer. Κέκροψ is doubtless explained as equivalent to "ancient," "antediluvian," "old foggy." With this implication Κρόνος is found in Ar. *Clouds* 929, cf. 1070, *Wasps* 1480; so also Ἰαπετός in *Clouds* 998, Plato *Symp.* 195 B, Κόδρος, Com. *Adesp.* 1044. I have not seen Κέκροψ in this sense, and Alciphron is not likely to have originated the locution, though it would sound natural enough in one of the comedians. κέρκωψ is the reading of several good MSS, and this suggests that κέρκωψ should be substituted for the common reading Κέκροψ. This change does away with the tautologous parallel Κέκροψ ἄθλιε . . . ὦ πρέσβυ which prompted Hercher to delete the latter phrase. For κέρκωψ as a term of vituperation, see Aeschin. ii. 40.

It may be remarked that Κέκροψ is wrongly written for κέρκωψ in other MSS, as, for example, in Hesych. s. v. and Apollod. ii. 6 (Wagner). In Ar. *Birds* 1407 Palmer and van Leeuwen would write Κερκωπίδα for Κερκωπίδα of all manuscripts.

II

Artemidorus *Onirocr.* ii. 25 (p. 119 Hercher). πίτυς καὶ στρόβιλος ναυκλήροις μὲν καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ναυτιλλομένοις πρὸς ναῦν εἰσὶ ληπτέαι διὰ τὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν νεῶν καὶ τὴν πίσσαν καὶ τὴν ῥητίνην τὴν ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν δένδρων γινομένην. τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἀρδίαις καὶ φνυγῆς εἰσὶ σημαντικαὶ διὰ τὸ φιλέρημον.

Of the two MSS that Hercher considered to be of supreme importance in constituting the text, V has φιλέρημον, L φιλήρεμον. The latter reading, though faulty, points the way to the correct one, which I believe to have been φιλήρεμον. Though inoffensive at first sight, φιλέρημον is open to objections. In the first place, the phrase διὰ τὸ φιλέρημον ought to mention some tolerably familiar characteristic of the pine and fir. But φιλέρημος is certainly no such familiar characteristic. This adjective is on the whole quite rare. It is applied to Hecate in an Orphic hymn (1. 4), to Adonis, again in an Orphic hymn (56. 2), to Pan once in Artemidorus (iv. 72, p. 246 H.), and once in Suidas, s. v. Πάν, to the cicada in Anth. Pal. ix. 373, and once in the Anthology (v. 8) it is used with the noun διαζυγία. It does not occur elsewhere with πίτυς or any other tree-name.

Besides, the conifers are not more *φιλήρημοι* than other forest trees. It is true that in bucolic and post-bucolic literature the pine becomes a sort of conventional background for pastoral scenes; so in Theocritus (i. 134, iii. 38, v. 49), in the Palatine Anthology (vi. 334 and vii. 703), and often in Longus. In an epigram of the Planudean Appendix (230) the pine is called *ποιμενία*. It is this convention, in part, that makes Πίτυς, the pine-nymph, a mistress of Pan, the herdsman's god, in the later literary mythologizing (Luc. *D. D.* 22. 4, Longus i. 27, ii. 7). Yet all this does not fully account for the epithet *φιλήρημος* in the passage cited from Artemidorus, especially when one considers that the tree's love for lonely places has not for the Greek reader the same appropriateness as an omen of exile that such an allusion would have for us. The banished Greek did not flee to desert places, but rather to a foreign city, where he might receive the protection of some patron, or eke out a living by work.

Now *φιλήρημος* is also a rare word, occurring, I think, only four times in the extant literature. In two of these four places it is applied to the stone-pine. One of them is in the letter of Alciphron (ii. 9 Schepers), where a rustic tells how he sat at noon under a wind-loving pine and charmed his cattle by the music of his pipes. The conventional bucolic motive is to be noted. The other is in the *Symposiaca* of Plutarch (676 A), where the banqueters discuss the question why the stone-pine is sacred to Poseidon. They agree that it is not because it grows by the shore, nor because it is wind-loving like the sea (*ὅτι φιλήρημός ἐστιν ὥσπερ ἡ θάλασσα*), for this also, Plutarch remarks, is stated by some writers, but rather because of its connection with ship-building; *καὶ γὰρ αὕτη* (i. e. *ἡ πίτυς*) *καὶ τὰ ἀδελφὰ δένδρα, πεῦκαι καὶ στρόβιλοι, τῶν τε ξύλων παρέχει τὰ πλοῖμώτατα, πίττης τε καὶ ῥητίνης ἀλοιφήν, ἥς ἄνευ τῶν συμπαγόντων ὄφελος οὐδὲν ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ.*

Two features of this passage deserve particular attention. First, the mention of the use of pine timber and pitch and rosin in ship building is quite enough like the corresponding passage in Artemidorus to justify the conjecture that the dream-interpreter had Plutarch's words in mind. If so, the restoration of *φιλήρημον* in Artemidorus is placed beyond question. The second important feature of the passage is that it treats *φιλήρημος* as an at least fairly well-known epithet of the pine—an epithet made familiar, it may be, by poetic usage. One might even try to recover from the words of Plutarch a hidden verse-tag, such as *πίτυς τε φιλήρημος ὥστε θάλασσα*.

But although the word *φιλήρημος* is extremely rare, there is ample proof that to the later Greeks at least the pine was the wind-loving tree *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. This convention begins, apparently, with the bucolic poets, who dwell lovingly upon the musical moaning of the pine in the winds. So Theocritus in the opening lines of the first idyl, Moschus v. 7, 8, and in three epigrams of pastoral coloring in the Appendix Planudea (12, 13, 227).

Latin parallels are quoted in the commentary of Fritzsche-Hiller on the Theocritean passage. This thought of the musical pine also played its part in the development of the story of Pan and Pitys; cf. Preller *Mythologie*¹, p. 740.

Another turn is given to the convention of the wind-loving tree in a group of five epigrams in the ninth book of the Palatine Anthology (30, 31, 105, 131, 376). The thought—evidently a school-theme—is the same in all. A stone-pine, broken or uprooted by the wind, rebukes a builder for his foolhardiness in daring to make a ship of that which is the special victim of the winds and hurricanes. The word *φιλήνεμος* is not used, but in every case the thought of the pine as the wind-tossed tree is present.

But—returning to our passage in Artemidorus—what has the wind-loving character of the pine to do with exile and flight? The dream-interpreter gives the clue himself in a passage which describes the significance of dreams about winds for those who expect absent friends (ii. 36, p. 138 H.): *ἀεὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀποδήμονας προσδοκῶσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν κλιμάτων ἐκείνων, οὗ εἰσὶν οἱ ἀπόδημοι, πνέοντές εἰσιν ἀγαθοί, οἱ δὲ ἐναντίοι κατέχουσι τοὺς ἀποδήμονας.*

φιλήνεμον, then, may be offered with some confidence as a substitute for Hercher's text.

III

Suidas ii. 1. 1234 (Bernhardy) *ὀφίοπους γυνή· ἔρπονσα.*

In place of the wholly inadequate *ἔρπονσα* some identification of this serpent-footed woman is to be expected. This may be obtained by reading *ἔμπονσα*, changing the breathing and one letter.

It must be admitted that the epithet *ὀφίοπους* does not tally with the most familiar description of the hobgoblin *Empusa*, Ar. *Frogs* 288-95, where we find in the last two lines

Δι. καὶ σκέλος χαλκοῦν ἔχει;
Εα. νῆ τὸν Ποσειδῶ, καὶ βολίτινον θάτερον.

This last characteristic is evidently a figment of Xanthias' imagination, and is recognized as such by the commentators. The rest of the description, however, is based upon popular superstition, and the tone of Dionysus' question shows that the bronze leg of *Empusa* was well-known in bog-lore. Yet the descriptions are by no means consistent. For example, the scholia on *Frogs*, *loc. cit.*, and *Eccl.* 1056 identify *Empusa* with *Ὀνοκώλη* or *Ὀνοκελῆς*, a monster with the legs of an ass; cf. Luc. *Ver. hist.* ii. 46.

It should be observed that while mixed or changing forms are attributed to many of the goblin figures of mythology, they are especially characteristic of the phantoms that have their origin in the dream or nightmare (see Laistner, *Das Rätsel der Sphinx* I, pp. 61-64; Roscher *Ephialtes*, pp. 8, 13, 64; Wundt *Völkerpsychologie* II. 2, p. 117). Since the connection of *Empusa* with the dream-demons may be regarded as

beyond doubt (Laistner *loc. cit.*; Roscher *op. cit.*, p. 38; Crusius *Philol.* L, p. 99), it is natural that her power of transformation should be her most prominent characteristic (cf. Luc. *De salt.* 19; Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* ii. 4; Roscher *Lexikon*, s. v. "Empusa"). Even Pan seems to have been represented at least once with snake-legs (Roscher *Ephialtes*, pp. 122 f.), and it is not surprising that the changeful Empusa should take on serpent coils.

However, it is not necessary to argue from general considerations only. The scholiast of the *Frogs* 293 quotes a passage from the *Ταγηνισταί* of Aristophanes (*Fr.* 500, 501 K.) as follows:

- A. χθονία θ' Ἑκάτη
σπείρας ὄφεων ἐλελιζομένη.
B. τί καλεῖς τὴν Ἑμπουσαν;

This fragment identifies Empusa with Hecate, as the scholiast observes (cf. Roscher *Lexikon*, col: 1898, s. v. "Hecate,") and also clearly attests some serpentine attribute for the former—a fact which was not noticed by Weizsäcker and Waser in the articles on "Empusa" in Roscher and Pauly-Wissowa.

In Lucian *Philops.* 22 there is a story, too long to quote in full, which bears upon the present discussion. The superstitious Eucrates tells a cock-and-bull yarn about a midday encounter with an apparition of a gigantic woman attended by barking dogs and carrying a flaming torch. She had snake-feet (τὰ μὲν ἐνερθεν ὀφίοπους ἦν) and serpents coiled about her neck and shoulders. The specter, to which he refers as Ἑκάτη, finally disappears into the earth.

After making due allowance for the *Aufschneiderei* in this story, there still remain a number of traits belonging to the domain of common superstition, which Lucian's infernal Hecate has in common with Aristophanes' Empusa. Lucian's phantom is attended by dogs, while the boggy described by Xanthias in the *Frogs* turns to a dog, and then, and not till then, Dionysus recognizes the description to be that of Empusa. Lucian's specter walks at midday, which is also a witching hour for Empusa (cf. Schol. Ar. *Frogs* 293). The monster of the *Philopseudes* is serpent-footed, while Aristophanes, in the fragment quoted gives Empusa snake coils. Finally, the torch of Lucian's Hecate has its counterpart in the uncanny light that flames from the face of Empusa (*Frogs* 293).

The word ὀφίοπους, used by Lucian in describing his monstrous woman, occurs, as far as I can discover, nowhere else except in the gloss in Suidas. I think, therefore, that the words ὀφίοπους γυνή in Suidas refer to the story in Lucian, and that the commentator explained them, not by the trifling ἑρπονσα of the MSS, but by the word ἑμπουσα, the name of the goblin identified with Hecate in popular folklore.

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES ON THE *EPITREPONTES* OF MENANDER

I. THE RECOGNITION SCENE, LL. 358-79

Habrotonon comes upon the stage, carrying the child which had been found exposed, wearing the ring of Charisios and other *γνωρίσματα*. She has already (cf. ll. 372, 401) spoken to Charisios according to her plan (ll. 294 ff.), exhibiting the ring and claiming to be the mother of the child. The scene being lost, we can only infer that Charisios admitted his deed of violence on the night of the Tauropolia, and thus removed all doubts in her mind (ll. 282 ff.) about the paternity of the child. We might perhaps infer from her *προσεποιησάμην* (l. 372), when speaking to Sophrone, that her claim of motherhood had been admitted, and that she assumes that the report had been carried to the neighboring house.¹ When Habrotonon appears, Sophrone comes out of the house of Smikrines, and is at once recognized by the former as the attendant of the girl who was ravished at the Tauropolia. Through the door, left open by Sophrone, she also sees Pamphile,² whom she recognizes as the girl she had seen at the Tauropolia, and concludes, from the situation, to be the daughter of Smikrines and wife of Charisios. The true state of affairs at once flashes upon her mind, and she bursts into joyful exclamations: ὦ φίλτατοι <θεοί> κτέ., l. 361 ff. (mostly indecipherable). She accosts Sophrone and the following dialogue takes place:

- SOPH. γύναι, πότεν ἔχεις, εἰπέ μοι, τὸν <παῖ>δα . . .
 λαβοῦσ'; HAB. ὁρᾷς τι, φιλτάτη, σοι γνῶριμ<ον> 370
 <ῶν> τοῦτ' ἔχει; μηδέν με δείσης, ὦ γύναι.
 SOPH. οὐκ <ἐτ>εκες αὐτῇ τοῦτο; HAB. προσεποιησάμην,
 οὐχ' ἴν' ἀδικήσω τὴν τεκοῦσαν, ἀλλ' ἵνα
 κατὰ σχολὴν εὐροίμι. νῦν δ' —. SOPH. εὐρηκας οὖν;
 HAB. ὁρῶ γὰρ ἦν καὶ τότε. SOPH. τίνος δ' ἐστὶν πατρός; 375
 HAB. Χαρισίου. SOPH. τοῦτ' οἶσθ' ἀκριβῶς, φιλτάτη;
 HAB. οὐ γὰρ τὴν νύμφην ὁρῶ
 τὴν ἔνδον οὖσαν. SOPH. ναίχι. HAB. μακαρία γύναι,
 θεῶν τις ἡμᾶς ἠλέησε.

When Sophrone recognizes something the child is wearing, Habrotonon knows the correctness of her conclusion that Pamphile is the child's mother. Here Sophrone (l. 375) not knowing the basis of Habrotonon's conclusions, might very pertinently inquire what reason there was for connecting this child with the maiden of the Tauropolia, but, knowing herself

¹ The same conclusion is perhaps to be drawn from the very puzzling fragment Q (ll. 428 ff.).

² Cf. ὁρῶ γὰρ ἦν καὶ τότε, l. 375, and τὴν νύμφην ὁρῶ τὴν ἔνδον οὖσαν, ll. 377-8; and see F. Leo *Hermes* XLIII (1908), p. 134.

that Pamphile is the mother, her whole interest lies in the question, "Who is its father?" Habrotonon answers "Charisios," and to the further question whether that is certain, she replies by another question, partly lost, to which Sophrone answers, "Yes." F. Leo (*loc. cit.*) decides that, since Habrotonon has never seen Pamphile, she is still uncertain that the girl she sees in the house is the wife of Charisios, and wants assurance of that. He, accordingly, supplies, though not to his own satisfaction, <οἶδ' εἰ γε σή' στ', ἀφ>' οὗ γε τὴν νύμφην ὀρώ. But there is no reason for assuming any doubt in Habrotonon's mind that the girl she sees in the house of Smikrines, the father-in-law of Charisios, is Charisios' wife. And, further, certainty on this point would add nothing to the proof that Charisios is the father, and this is the point at which Sophrone's question aims. Now the paternity of Charisios is proved by the ring. Probably, then, Habrotonon produces the ring, and asks whether Pamphile got it from her ravisher. That she asks a question, rather than states the fact, need not imply that there is any doubt in her own mind, since her interview with Charisios. Still we must bear in mind that we are given to understand, in the early part of the play, that Charisios does not know what had become of his ring. He knows only that he lost it on the night of the Tauropolia; cf. <ὃν ἀπώλεσεν, l. 177, τοῦτόν ποτε μεθύων ἀπώλ>εσ' ὡς εἶφη, l. 190, Ταυροπολίου ἀπώλεσεν τοῦτόν ποτε, l. 234, ἀπέβαλεν δέ, φής, Ταυροπολίου αὐτόν; (ONES.) παροινῶν γ' ὡς ἐμοὶ τὸ παιδάριον εἶφ' ἀκόλονθος, l. 255. The insistence upon the intoxication in this connection seems to be intended to explain why Charisios does not know what had become of his ring. We may suppose, too, that if he had given it to Pamphile, or known she had taken it, he would not have proclaimed his loss. It may well be, then, that to the mind of Habrotonon there is still lacking one link in the chain of proof. She is cautious in her conclusions (cf. ll. 282 ff.). She knows that Charisios ravished a girl at the Tauropolia and that Pamphile was ravished then. If she learns that Pamphile took from her ravisher the ring that was found with the child, the chain of proof is completed. She, therefore asks, οὐχ οὗτος ἦν τοῦδ' οὗ γε τὴν νύμφην ὀρώ; "Did not this (ring) belong to him whose bride I see?"

II. ONESIMUS

Wilamowitz in the *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterthum* XXI (1908), p. 52, takes the view that Onesimus, when he gets the ring from Syrisus, knows that the child belongs to Charisios and Pamphile, and consequently fears to divulge the secret to his master, lest, when the natural reconciliation followed, he should be punished for his former slander of his mistress. Leo (*loc. cit.*, p. 135) also thinks that, as early as ll. 251 ff., Onesimus and Habrotonon have a suspicion that Pamphile is the mother of the newly discovered child, for he says, "dass Pamphile

geboren hat, ist die Voraussetzung des Dialogs, 251 ff. (αὐτὴ ὅστιν τυχόν 268)." But the reference here (the proper reading is αὐτὴ not αὐτῇ) is not to Pamphile, but to the girl Habrotonon had seen at the Tauropolia. Onesimus says, "She is the one, perhaps," i. e., whom Charisios probably violated (cf. ll. 236, 257). Wilamowitz, however, holds that Onesimus conceals from Habrotonon his suspicion that Pamphile is the mother. But there is not the slightest reason for believing that Onesimus himself had this suspicion. It would, indeed, be a rash conclusion. He knows that Pamphile has borne a child and concealed it, but knows nothing of the preceding circumstances. Knowing the time of the birth of her child he might, indeed, figure out that Pamphile's indiscretion or ravishment must have been about the time of the Tauropolia. But what was there to suggest such a thought? Only the apparent age of the child could suggest that it might be Pamphile's.¹ Onesimus' reluctance to give the ring to Charisios and narrate the circumstances of its recovery is based entirely upon the evil results to him of his former revelation (ll. 205 ff.). He fears to stir up new trouble (ll. 211, 231, 238-40). He has said farewell to meddling (ll. 355 ff.). The fact is—and this is decisive upon the point—that he would have jumped at the chance to bring the husband and wife together again and thus remove their anger against him. After such a joyful ending all would have been forgiven (Pamphile is of a forgiving nature, l. 421). It is inconceivable that in his soliloquies before Habrotonon comes in (ll. 202 ff.) and after she has gone (ll. 340 ff.), he should not have expressed the suspicion of Pamphile's motherhood more clearly. How, in particular, could he make such a remark as the following (ll. 349 ff.): νῦν ἐπισφαλῇ | τὰ πράγματ' ἐστὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν κεκτημένην· | ταχέως· εἰ γὰρ εὐρεθῇ πατρὸς κόρη | ἐλευθέρου μήτηρ τε τοῦ νῦν παιδός, ὅς > | γέγονεν, ἐκείνην λήψεται ταύτην <ἀφείς>, even though we assume, as I do, that ταύτην is Habrotonon, not Pamphile? It would be strange, too, that he should urge Habrotonon (ll. 280 f.) to find out who the girl was whom she had seen at the Tauropolia, for that could only lead to the discovery he is supposed to fear.

III. LL. 385 ff.

Χόλη

μέλαινα προσπέτωκεν ἢ τοιοντονὶ
τις ἀγαντὶς ἐν ἄλλο γέγονε . .

I suggest, for the last line, *τι μελάντ<ερον οἶον οὐδ' ἐν ἄλλο γέγονί <πω>* "black bile or something blacker such as nothing else has yet been."

A. G. LAIRD

¹ Onesimus was not present when Daos mentioned the time of discovering the child (l. 26).

TWO NOTES ON LATIN SATIRE

I. LUCILIUS FRAGMENT 605 [MARX] AND THE CALLING OF ROMAN ASSEMBLIES

Since many of the fragments of Lucilius are preserved in the pages of Nonius the grammarian we gain but little information as to their immediate context and sequence.¹ It is of the interpretation of one such isolated fragment that I wish to speak.

rauco contionem sonitu et curvis cogant cornibus.

On this fragment Marx II, XXVI. 605² says:

tragoediae argumentum enarrat et examinat eius utilitatem: . . . Ad Pacuvii Armorum Iudicium spectare Lucilii crisin probabile est: . . . morem Romanum adplicat poeta aetati Troicae.

As to whether or not we have here a scene from a Greek tragedy with plot of the Trojan cycle, but painted in Roman colors as Marx supposes, it is really impossible to decide; nor is the question a vital one. My effort therefore will be rather to show that whether the scene be Homeric or Roman, the usage described is the Roman method of summoning the assembly, and not that of the Homeric heralds.³

To my mind this conclusion is rendered probable by a comparison with a little noticed passage in the *Antiquitates Romanae* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus ii. 8. 4: τοὺς μὲν πατρικίους ὁπότε δόξειε τοῖς βασιλεῦσι συγκαλεῖν, οἱ κήρυκες ἐξ ὀνόματος τε καὶ πατρόθεν ἀνηγόμενον, τοὺς δὲ δημοτικούς ὑπηρεταὶ τινὲς ἀθρόους κέρασι βοείους ἐμβυκανῶντες ἐπὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας συνήγον. Furthermore, in Mommsen's *Staatsrecht* I³, p. 363, we have the activity of the heralds in summoning the senators to the *curia* and the people to the *contio* and *comitia* discussed. As far as the senators are concerned the statement of Dionysius seems to be expressly confirmed by Livy iii. 38. 8; also by the testimony of Dionysius himself in two other passages, ix. 63. 2 and xi. 4. 1. In the last of these the phrase ἐξ ὀνόματος is again applied to the summons to the senators.

Mommsen I, p. 364, n. 7, expresses his doubt as to the existence of the method of calling by name, and maintains that the senators were called

¹Since our fragment is isolated in Nonius the conservative method of interpretation would seem to be to consider its contents separately without undue prejudice for the ingenious but virtually *flat* context woven about it in the editions of Müller and Marx.

²Of. also Baehrens *Poetae Latini minores* VI. 469; Müller *Lucilii saturarum reliquiae* XXVI. 33, and Lachmann XXVI. 585.

³It seems needless to refute in detail this erroneous supposition of Lucian Müller. His own Homeric parallels are not in point and an examination of all the passages under κήρυξ in Ebeling's Homeric lexicon reveals not a single instance of the use of the horn or trumpet in Homer. On the contrary Homer's heralds, as is well known, assembled the people by shouting. Cf. Buchholz *Homerische Realien* II, § 12, pp. 43 ff.

from their homes by the *viatores*, while the actual reading of the names he characterizes as "übel erfunden." In regard to the first point an examination of the passages cited by Mommsen and in particular the testimony of Festus (p. 371 ed. Müller; cf. Pliny *N. H.* xviii. 3. 20) seems to show not that the heralds were *not* used to summon the senators from their city houses, but rather that the *viatores*, as, indeed, their name implies, were especially used to summon senators from their suburban estates. Indeed, Cicero in *De sen.* 16. 56, clearly states this in the case of Cincinnatus. We have thus a natural differentiation between the *praecones* and *viatores*, two classes of *apparitores*. As to the reading of the names: such a ceremony seems to me entirely in keeping with the traditional simplicity of the small city state just developing from a rude agglomeration of clan settlements. Originally the clan chieftains and the senators, their successors, were familiarly and honorably called by their own names and as the sons of respected sires. We even have occasional survivals of this practice under the empire when the ordinary method of summons was by the imperial edict. Thus in Suetonius *Vita Claudii* 36 we read: *senatum per praecones propere convocavit*.

In regard to the summons to the people. Here since the great Roman assembly, the *comitia centuriata* was originally the assembly of all armed freemen meeting outside the *pomerium*, we may fairly look for the contradiction or confirmation of the statement of Dionysius in the method of calling a *contio* of soldiers by the commanding general. We find confirmation;¹ the blowing of the trumpet is the well-recognized summons. But we have specific testimony to this military method of summoning the *comitia centuriata* itself in addition to the analogy of military usage. Thus Aulus Gellius *Noct. Att.* xv. 27. 2, quoting the jurist Labeo: *Curiata per lectorem curiatum "calari" id est convocari, centuriata per cornicinem*. From this passage it is not unnatural to infer that the *cornicines* are the *ministri* referred to as *ἰσχυρῆται* in the passage quoted from Dionysius. Again we have a striking survival of this old custom in the case of public executions and trials before the *comitia centuriata* outside the city walls. Thus when a citizen was summoned to trial on a capital charge, e. g., Gaius Gracchus,² the trumpet was sounded in certain public places and before the defendant's house. Varro, indeed (*De ling. Lat.* vi. 91, 92), gives the exact decree in such cases. Tacitus *Ann.* ii. 32. 5, speaking of the case of P. Mucius under the year 16 A. D., gives an interesting survival of the custom.³

Within the walls, naturally, the method of summons was civic rather than military, and hence we may agree with Mommsen *loc. cit.*, I, p. 199.

¹ Livy vii. 36. 9; viii. 7. 14, 32. 1; xxvi. 48. 13.

² Plutarch *C. Gracchus* 3. 836; Seneca *De ira* i. 16. 15.

³ Here as Furneaux suggests the summons was to witness an execution.

Indeed, even outside of the city walls the duties of the *cornicen* were, perhaps, performed under the general supervision of the *praeco*.

To sum up: (1) On the basis of the cumulative evidence afforded by the testimony of such writers as Varro, Livy, Dionysius, and Aulus Gellius, we may venture to say that our passage refers to the *Roman method* of convoking an assembly of freemen outside the *pomerium*, presumably by the horns of the *cornicines*. (2) As we have a survival of this practice in the case of capital trials and executions in the last two centuries of the republic and in the early empire, it is tempting to conjecture that Lucilius may be speaking of some such contemporary trial on a capital charge. Like Marx's Homeric scene, however, this is only a possibility.

II. VARRO'S MENIPPEAN SATIRE, FRAGMENT 57 [BÜCHELER'S PETRONIUS] AND THE CHOLIAMBIC METER

I wish here to present an interpretation of a very corrupt line in the *Bimarchus* of Varro, No. 57 in Bücheler's minor edition of Petronius. In order to secure a working text I accept with Bücheler the clever restoration of Vahlen,¹ but hold that even upon the assumption that this restoration is approximately correct, Vahlen, if I understand his Latin note, misses Varro's main point. The restored text reads:

ne mé pedatus — — versuum tardor
refrenet arte compari rythmon certum.

Vahlen interprets this: "ne pedata versuum tarditate retinear aequabilitatem certorum numerorum secutus." This he further explains as meaning: "varie et versibus et sermone miscere orationem placet," that is, the use of a form of composition presumably, though Vahlen does not explicitly say this, the Menippean satire—in which verse and prose are pleasantly blended.

To my mind, however, the point in the line is a purely metrical allusion to the limping effect produced in the choliambic verse by the breaking-up of the even flow of iambic feet by the substitution at the end of the line of the trochee. Hence the further designation of "seazon" by the Greek metricians. Varro then simply says, translating literally, "Lest the limping slowness of my verse should check me from the even or uninterrupted art of definite or regularly recurring measures."

It will be noticed that *compari*, paraphrased with some strain by *aequabilitatem* in Vahlen's note, is harsh, the fact being that its presence in the original text is by no means assured. It is not, however, at all essential to the general sense of the passage according to my interpretation. Varro simply means that in the choliambic meter the limping slowness of the measure precludes the art shown in measures with more

¹ *Coniectanea in Varronis saturarum reliquias*, p. 138.

uninterrupted rhythmic flow, such, for example, as the dactylic hexameter or the iambic senarius.

To the whimsical mind of Varro the literal meaning of *pedatus* may lend itself to this interpretation. Thus we find the word used by Pliny *N. H.* xvii. 35. 10: *aut pedatae vineae simplici iugo* and Columella iv. 20, of vines propped up. Hence the limping measure is a "propped measure," or, as Varro phrases it, has a "propped slowness" about it, with the suggestion, of course, of the crutch.

To express such a criticism of the ἥθος of the choliambic meter in that meter is quite in keeping with Varro's childlike pedantry. Indeed, such a criticism may be regarded as especially appropriate at a time when the choliambic verse was just becoming known to the Romans through the metrical experiments of Cn. Matius, Laevius, and Varro himself, the first Roman metrical theorizer and "practitioner."¹ Varro we know introduced into his *Menippean Satires* many new metrical forms based on Greek models.

Finally it is to be noticed that the expression in a given verse-form of the limitations or peculiarities of that meter was a not uncommon conceit among the ancients. Thus Critias of Alcibiades:²

καὶ τῶν κλεινῶν νῖδων Ἀθηναίων στεφανώσω
Ἀλκιβιάδην νέουσιν ὑμνήσας τρόποις.
οὐ γάρ πως ἦν τοῦνομ' ἐφαρμόζειν ἐλεγείῳ
νῦν δ' ἐν ἱαμβείῳ κείσεται οὐκ ἀμέτρως.

So in Lucilius vi. 229, Marx, perhaps of the Sigillaria:

quem plane hexametro versu non dicere possis

Better known are Horace's allusion, *Sat.* i. 5. 86, to the unmanageable Apulian town of *Equus Tuticus*, and the metrical allusion of Ovid *Ex ponto* iv. 12. 1 ff. to Tuticanus.

GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

JUVENAL I. 7-9

Nota magis nulli domus est sua quam mihi lucus
Martis et Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum
Vulcani

The scholiast remarks: "Lucum Martis dicit qui Romae est in Appia in quo solebant recitare poetae; aut illum qui apud Colchos est in quo fuit pellis aurea; aut in quo Ilia peperit."

In the subscription to the first book of Martianus Capella some MSS read: "Securus Memor Felix v. sp. com. consist. rhetor R. ex mendosis-

¹Cf. Gleditsch *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*, p. 248. On Varro's importance compare the words of his contemporary, Cicero, *Acad. post.* i. 9.

²Bergk-Hiller *Anth.*, frag. 5.

simis exemplaribus emendabam contra legente Deuterio scholastico discipulo meo Romae ad portam Capenam cos. Paulini v. c. sub d. non. Martiarum Christo adiuvante." This Felix was a *rhetor urbis Romae* and corrected his copy of Martianus Capella in 534 A. D. In the *Ber. d. k. sächs. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften*, 1851, p. 352, Jahn makes this note: "Er hatte sein Auditorium *ad portam Capenam*. Vielleicht kann man die noch nicht erklärte Notiz des Scholiasten zu Juv. i. 7 damit zusammenbringen: Der Tempel des Mars ist nicht weit vor der *porta Capena*, und wenn dort das Auditorium des *rhetor urbis Romae* lag, war die Verwechselung nicht so arg, die Recitationen der Dichter, wie sie früher üblich waren, dahin zu verlegen."

Hülsem in discussing the shrine of the Camenae (Jordan-Hülsem, *Topographie* I, 3, 208) says: "Bemerkenswerth ist, dass auch in später Kaiserzeit beim Camenenheiligthum resp. in unmittelbarer Nähe der Porta Capena Locale für litterarische Versammlungen, Recitationen von Dichtern u. s. w. sich befanden." In the note he quotes the passage from Juvenal and says: "Ob der Dichter selbst auf eine solche Localität hat anspielen wollen, bleibe dahingestellt; in der Zeit der Scholiasten muss sie jedenfalls existirt haben. Das damit zusammen vorkommende *antrum Vulcani* ist bemerkenswerth, besonders da ein *antrum Cyclopis* in der zweiten Region an der Grenze der ersten bezeugt ist. . . ." He then cites the subscription to the Capella MSS, and the following passage from a letter of Symmachus to Ausonius, on the occasion of the elevation of the latter to the consulship (*Ep.* i. 20): "Bene ac sapienter maiores nostri . . . aedes Honori atque Virtuti gemella facie iunctim locarunt. Sed enim propter etiam Camenarum religio sacro fontis advertitur, quia iter ad capessendos magistratus saepe litteris promovetur."

Lastly, Stara-Tedde, in discussing the *lucus Martis* (*Bull. Com.*, 1907, 181) says: "Ivi [i. e. outside the *porta Appia*] dunque si deve pure collocare il *lucus*, cui forse allude Giovenale, i. 7."

Now while all would admit at once that the reading of the poet's passage in its context would never suggest anything but the scholiast's second explanation, and while no editor, so far as I have been able to discover, not even the encyclopedic Mayor, makes the slightest reference to the first, evidently regarding it as undeserving of a single word, it is interesting to observe that the archaeologists seem to think it at least as possible as the second. In admitting this possibility, however, they seem to me to have overlooked certain facts.

In the first place it is very hazardous to connect any point properly designated as *ad portam Capenam* with the *lucus Martis*, inasmuch as all topographers are agreed in locating the temple of Mars two kilometres beyond the *porta Capena* and outside the line of the Aurelian wall, and it is highly improbable that the sacred grove was of any great size. A

grove that was certainly considerably more than a kilometre distant could not be spoken of as *ad portam Capenam*. Therefore the rhetor Felix would not have spoken of himself as working *ad portam Capenam* if he had been working in the *lucus Martis*. Furthermore, while Jahn's explanation that Felix had his lecture room in this part of the city is perfectly possible, its reference may just as probably be applied to his house. The Caelian was a favorite residential quarter during the empire. The passage from Symmachus need mean nothing more than that the proximity of the shrine of the *Camenae*—always regarded as a source of poetic inspiration—to the temple of *Honos* and *Virtus* emphasized the real connection between literary success and official position (*honos*) through *virtus*, a connection just illustrated so effectively in the case of Ausonius. Any further implication seems to me improbable because wholly unnecessary. I think, therefore, there is no real support for the first explanation of the scholiast in either of these supposed parallels.

In the second place the correspondence between *antrum Vulcani* and *antrum Cyclopi* might be suggestive, were it not for the additional modifiers *Aeoliis vicinum rupibus*. This is so obvious that one would regard any mention of it as a waste of time, had it not been apparently overlooked. It is the *Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum Vulcani* that is in the mind of the poet, and this is closely united with *lucus Martis*. The two belong together, and it is manifestly impossible to explain *lucus Martis* as referring to an assembling-place of poets in Rome, and *antrum Vulcani* as referring to the Lipari islands. If the first refers to the temple of Mars in Rome, the second must also refer to some monument or locality in the same neighborhood, and to identify *Aeoliis rupibus* with any part of the Caelian hill would tax the ingenuity of the most imaginative of topographers.

The impossibility of admitting his first explanation of Juvenal's reference does not of course impugn the veracity of the scholiast's statement that poets had been wont to read in the grove of Mars.

S. B. P.

--- OVID *FASTI* IV. 209

*Ardue iam dudum resonat tinnitibus Ide,
tutus ut infanti vagiat ore puer.*

209 *Pars clipeos manibus, galeas pars tundit inanes:
hoc Curetes habent, hoc Corybantes opus.
res latuit, priscique manent imitamina facti:
aera deae comites raucaque terga movent.*

213 *cymbala pro galeis, pro scutis tympana pulsant,
tibia dat Phrygios, ut dedit ante, modos.*

In verse 209, twenty-eight MSS read *manibus*, two MSS give *rudibus*, Lactantius has *sudibus*, while editors in general read *rudibus*.

The change rests, I believe, on a mistaken basis. Tradition gave the Curetes sword and shield as it is evident from Dionysius Hal. ii. 60: χορείαν δὲ καὶ κίνησιν ἐνόπλιον, καὶ τὸν ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν ἀποτελούμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχειριδίων ψόφον, εἴ τι δὲ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τεκμηροῦσθαι λόγοις, Κούρητες ἦσαν οἱ πρῶτοι καταστησάμενοι. It is probably to this tradition that we owe the change of *manibus* to *rudibus*.

But in descriptions of the Curetes tradition was not always blindly followed; Apollodorus, for instance (i. 1. 7) gave spears to the Curetes, and a terra-cotta relief reproduced in Roscher shows Curetes striking shields together. The pyrrhic was a development of the Curete dance, but the pyrrhic relief in the Acropolis Museum shows the right hand empty, as does the similar relief found at Praeneste.

Ovid, then, was not without a precedent in not following tradition, and that he did not follow it is evident from the position of the helmets, which are not worn on the head, but carried in the hand. Even the editors of *rudibus* could not follow tradition exactly, for some of the participants must bear sword and shield, others sword and helmet. Now as Ovid evidently did not follow the accepted tradition, there is a possible, perhaps probable, view of his words which will allow us to accept *manibus* as the right reading, in accordance with the great majority of MSS.

The key to the matter lies, I think, in v. 213: *cymbala pro galeis, pro scutis tympana pulsant*. We should bear in mind that Ovid is describing the ministers of Cybele, the Corybantes, and that the emphasis lies on them, not on Curetes. But the Corybantes carried tympana and cymbala only, and if we are to have an exact parallel with the Curetes, then the latter, from whom, as Ovid says, the Corybantes are derived, must bear only such weapons as can be replaced by tympana and cymbala. This exact correspondence can be found by reading *manibus* in vs. 209, for then we shall have the shields struck with the hand for the tympana (*pro scutis tympana*), and the helmets for the cymbala (*cymbala pro galeis*), but the helmets must be struck together. The parallel is then perfect, swords being omitted as having no counterpart among the instruments of the Corybantes.

W. E. D. DOWNES

FARMINGTON, MAINE

NOTE ON PLATO *PHILEBUS* 11 B, C.

Φίληβος μὲν τοῖνυν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι φησι τὸ χαίρειν πᾶσι ζώοις . . . τὸ δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀμφισβήτημά ἐστι, μὴ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ τὸ νοεῖν . . . ἀμείνω καὶ λῶφ γίγνεσθαι ξύμπασιν, ὅσαπερ αὐτῶν δυνάτ' ἀμεταλαβεῖν. δυνάτοίς δὲ μετασχῆν ὠφελιμώτατον ἀπάντων εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς οὐσί τε καὶ ἰσομένοισι.

There are two problems here: (1) The use of *ἀγαθόν* without the article; (2) The construction of *δυνάτοίς δὲ μέτασχῆν*, etc.

(1) Kühner-Gerth § 462. 1, say, citing this passage and *Rep.* 505 C, that the substantively used adjective must stand without the article when it is the predicate. That is hardly true as appears from Aristotle's remark, *An. Pri.* 1. 40: ἐπεὶ δ' οὐ ταῦτόν ἐστι τὸ εἶναι τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ εἶναι τὴν ἡδονὴν τὸ ἀγαθόν. Plato himself uses *τάγαθόν γε αὐτὸ* as predicate in *Phileb.* 67 A, though the passage has been otherwise and wrongly construed. The *Hippias Major* (287 D) dwells on the distinction between *καλὸν* and *τὸ καλόν* but later neglects it, once in mere carelessness (293 E) and once with intentional fallacy (297 C). We need not therefore with Grote speak of a fallacy in *Philebus* 11 B, or with Poste assume a recognition of the Megarian or Stoic idea that there is no good except the good. It is merely a case of what Wilamowitz calls the "sane nonchalance" of Greek style. The meaning is perfectly plain, and the semblance of formal fallacy is cured by *πάνσι*. What is good for all is the good.

(2) *δυνατοῖς δὲ μετασχεῖν*, etc., is translated by Jowett: "And that to all such who are or ever will be they (*τὸ φρονεῖν*, etc.) are the most advantageous of all things." Bury approves of Stallbaum's explanation: *δυνατοῖς δὲ μετασχεῖν (αὐτῶν) ὠφελιμώτατον (αὐτὸ S. μετασχεῖν) εἶναι*. Neither of these constructions is grammatically probable or yields the true meaning. Jowett's interpretation does not explain the singular *ὠφελιμώτατον*, which cannot be accounted for "by the correspondence in which it stands to *ἀγαθόν*." Stallbaum's construction involves, as Badham says, a harsh ellipse, and shares with Jowett's the difficulty that *δυνατοῖς* so used requires the article. Badham (2d ed.) in despair reads *τὸ δὲ μετασχεῖν*, rejecting *δυνατοῖς* as a bad interpolation. All these interpretations yield the tautology that intelligence is the good and it or the participation in it is beneficial. What Plato wishes to say is that intelligence, etc., are better than pleasure for all who are capable of participating in them, and that *to be so capable* is *ὠφελιμώτατον* to all creatures. To get this meaning from the text we need only construe *εἶναι* twice, once with *δυνατοῖς* and once with *ὠφελιμώτατον*. The repetition of *εἶναι* would have been very awkward, and there is no lack of examples of such double functioning. Cf. in addition to Kühner-Gerth 597 f., *Rep.* 604 B: *περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἅμα δύο φανέν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι*; Marchant on Thucyd. i. 136. 4; Plato *Gorg.* 489 C.

The dative predicate, *δυνατοῖς*, is familiar. Cf. Kühner-Gerth 475. 2 b, and *Epinomis* 978 C, *Rep.* 361 B, and *Tim.* 77 C, where failure to recognize the construction has led many astray. This interpretation does justice to a common but often overlooked force of *δὲ*. It is used, as Cicero sometimes employs *autem*, to pick up and define or comment on a repeated term (*δυνατὰ . . . δυνατοῖς*). Cf. *Rep.* 337 D, 338 D, 490 B, 358 D; *Symp.* 193 B; *Phaedr.* 239 A; *Laws* 650 A. The possible objection that *εἶναι* as articular (substantive) inf. would need the article may

be met by citing *Gorg.* 470 A: *σμικρὸν δύνασθαι*, and also by the consideration that the article would interfere with its other function of copula.

As for the thought, it is Plato's manner to distinguish thus explicitly those who can and those who cannot partake of higher things. Cf. *Epinomis* 978 C. πολλοῖς . . . οὐδ' εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἡ φύσις παραγέγονεν ὥστε μαθεῖν δυνατοῖς εἶναι; *Tim.* 47 A, B; *Protag.* 372 D; *Phaedr.* 247 A; *Phileb.* 22 B. Our passage, then, means that the gifts of intelligence are better than pleasure for all who are able to share them and that to be so able is the highest blessing for every creature.

PAUL SHOREY

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF SIMPLICIUS *DE CAELO*

P. 297. 7 (ed. Heiberg): for τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει the context requires that we read: τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ.

P. 456. 2: for καὶ πράξεως καὶ ζωῆς, ἔμψυχα δηλονότι, ὅλα μετέχει τὰ οὐράνια, read: ἔμψυχα δηλονότι ὄντα.

P. 488. 28: for ἀπλανῶν read: πλανωμένων.

P. 502. 3: for πρὸ τῶν φερουσῶν τὴν διὰ τεττάρων read: τὸν Δία. Cf. *Alex. Met.* 705. 10: τῶν σφαιρῶν τῶν φερουσῶν τὸν Δία.

PAUL SHOREY

BOOK REVIEWS

M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Libri xii. Edidit
LUDOVICUS RADEMACHER. Pars Prior, libros i-vi continens.
Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. 359. M. 3.

Complete editions of Quintilian recur in cycles, it would seem, of about twenty years. Halm's appeared in 1868, Meister's in 1886, and now we have the first volume of a new critical text. The intimation made in 1891 by Ferdinand Becher that he had such a task in hand sufficed to turn away from it others who may then have had inclinations in that direction. But ten years later Becher died and the new editor has fallen heir to his labors. In form and feature Radermacher's edition is meant to replace Bonnell's well-known text, published in the Teubner series over half a century ago. In the interval the criticism of Quintilian has made conspicuous progress, and with the help of his coadjutors Radermacher has turned to good account, without overloading his apparatus, the floating material that lay ready to his hand. Becher had completed only his commentary on the first book, but for the rest he left copious notes, critical and illustrative. As regards the MSS, his chief contribution was a complete collation of the Paris codex (7723) which belonged to Laurentius Valla: for Book x its readings have already been incorporated in the Oxford edition, where see p. lxxiv. Of this codex, which he calls P, the editor has made good use throughout, supporting or correcting it by Par. 7725 (Q), and for the great lacunae also by a fifteenth-century MS in the Vatican (1762=V). No reference is made to any of the MSS in English libraries. And yet in view of the present condition of the *Vallensis* (Praef., p. ix), recourse might very well be had to Harl. 4995, which I used for the Oxford edition of Book x. And some reference might have been looked for to Harl. 2662 (H), a tenth- or eleventh-century codex, which ranks as the oldest *complete* MS of Quintilian in existence. If it is considered of no great importance, as being probably in great part a copy of the *Bambergensis*, it may be replied that the latter is itself a copy of the *Bernensis*. All three are practically contemporary, and some examination of the *Harleianus* might have shed light on the added parts of the Bamberg MS (G) as well as the readings of the second-hand (b). Alongside of H, the readings of such codices as the *Florentinus* (F) and the *Turicensis* (T) become more or less superfluous. That Radermacher will do well to take account of H for the

later books, especially where the *Ambrosianus* fails, will appear from the following jottings which I have culled from my notes. The reading given is in each case that found in the *Harleianus*.

VI Prooem. §4: *nisi quod* (for *quam quod*). This should be restored to the text, especially as I am able to report that it is also the reading of the *Bambergensis* (G), as well as of V and S: *ibid.* § 7 *quam* for *quod* (A G). At i, §43, H is the only MS that shows *inquit*, hitherto credited to the *ed. Campana*: cf. § 47 *ita neque* (with P V) *itaque ne*.

V Prooem. §1 *gratia* (with A) for *vel ira*. Here the second hand in Bg. has *vel gratia*. At 4, §1, we have another remarkable instance of reversion to A: *altera quaestionem vel falsa* A H, where Bg. shows *quaestionem* written over the words of the text *etiam causam*. Cf. i. 4, §24: *computabo* (with A) for *putabo*: 7, §33 *agentibus* (with A P) for *agendi* (B).

Moreover, for the early part of the first book, where the *Bambergensis* almost entirely fails, H should be quoted in its stead: e.g., Pr. §5 *feri oratorem non posse*, §14 *sapientiae studiosi*, §25 *demonstraturi*. Again in the Prooemium §4 H shows *summ* (*ā ī*) *neloquentiē*; the archetype probably had *summam eloquentiae*, for the passage relied on at x. 1. 97 to support *summam in eloquentia* is not exactly parallel. At i. 1. 19 H supports the vulgate *per singulos annos prorogatum*: and gives at i. 2. 4: *nam et potest turpis esse domesticus ille praeceptor*. At i. 3. 14 it has *discipulis* for *discentis*.

Radermacher makes generous reference to the labors of his predecessors. He holds fast (Praef., p. vi) to the established division of the MSS into three main families, and gives reasons (p. xi) why A should not always be preferred to B. Moreover, his careful selection of authorities has enabled him very considerably to simplify the critical apparatus. In particular, references to the *edd. vett.* are now in the main superfluous, as their readings in important places have been traced to one or other of the numerous MSS by which our knowledge of Quintilian's text has become enlarged.

W. PETERSON

MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL

November 1, 1907

Renkema's Observationes criticae et exegeticae ad C. Valerii Flacci Argonautica. Traiecti ad Rhenum, 1906. Pp. 63. M. 3.

This pamphlet on Valerius Flaccus' epic comes not inopportunately at no great distance of time from the publication of Giarratano's epoch-making edition of the text (1904). Renkema adds several new emendations to the already large collection recorded by Giarratano. I cannot

honestly say that any of them seems to me convincing, but the discussion of crucial passages which accompanies them is scholarly and suggestive. Renkema naturally deals with many of the points raised by Langen's usually trustworthy commentary (1890), and his criticisms appear to me to raise real questions and to open up solutions which may be right. In other cases his disputation is less to the point and its result unsatisfactory. For instance, it may be true—and probably is—that *sacrae harenae* (iv. 230) can scarcely mean that the shore where Pollux is to fight with Amycus is consecrated because of the religious character of the spectacle; but that is no reason for interpreting *sacrae* as "accursed." The very similar passage quoted by Renkema (iv. 746) where the shore is called *saeuae*, suggests that in iv. 230 *sacrae* is an error for *saeuae*. The *crux* in iv. 136 *reges preme dure secundos* is not likely to be a corruption of *rex te premet arte secunda*, even if *treme* is rejected as not sufficiently accounting for *secundos*. And who can believe that in iv. 366 f. where MSS give *Muneris ille potens custodem protinus Argum Adiungit custos Argus placet*, we are to substitute *acrem* for *Argum*? But at iv. 507 *tonuit cum forte Veseui Hesperiae letalis apex*, where Langen absurdly believed *forte* to be an adjectival adverb, Renkema has an excellent discussion on *cum forte* which he shows from *Aen.* ix. 437, xi. 450 to be especially used in similes and not open to any real doubt in the passage of Valerius.

ROBINSON ELLIS

OXFORD

Die Eumeniden des Aischylos. Erklärende Ausgabe. Von FRIEDRICH BLASS. Berlin: Weidmann, 1907. Pp. 179. M. 5.

Blass's posthumous *Eumenides* is marked by the terseness, directness, and avoidance of mere erudition which distinguished his *Choephoron* (*Class. Philol.*, Vol. I, p. 440).

The Introduction sets forth clearly how the hero-drama is transformed into a Götterdrama symbolical of the advance from the old to the new moral order. The resemblance of Aeschylus' ideas to those expressed by Plato in the *Laws* is emphasized. The Areopagus passage is taken as a protest against the reforms of Ephialtes, not as a warning against going farther. Changes of scene take place not only at l. 63 by the *eccyclema*, and after l. 234 from Delphi to Athens, but by implication from Athena's temple to the Areopagus after 566. The independence of *fgh* from *M* is maintained.

Among the more notable readings or interpretations accepted are: 21: *εὐλόγως* for *ἐν λόγους*; 294: *οὐ κατηρεφῇ* (notes *μή*) for *ῆ*; 304: *σκιαῖ* for *σκιά*; 494: *νῦν μεταστροφᾶι νέων θεσμίων, ἣ κρατήσῃ δίκᾳ* (τε) καὶ βλάβᾳ,

where the notes affirm, I think wrongly, that *δίκαι καὶ βλάβαι* must mean "the just punishment;" 506: οὐ βίβαι, ἃ τλάμων; 521: τίς δὲ μηδὲν ἐν φάει (= μηθὲν ἐμφανές) καρδίαν ἀν' (ἔτι) τρέων. In 516 (τὸ δεινὸν εἶ) εἶ is taken with *δαί μένειν* below. On 585-608 the number of the chorus is fixed at twelve. On 429 ff. it is argued that Aeschylus, like Plato, objects to the evidential oath on principle and not merely to its application in a case where the issue depends on the intention not on the act. Accordingly *εὐθείαν* (*δίκην*) 433 is said to be simply the antithesis of *σκολιάν*. Athena does not vote but merely announces that if the votes are evenly divided her voice will decide for the defendant. In 735 therefore *τῇνδε* refers to the preceding line and is not to be taken deictically of the *ψήφος*.

PAUL SHOREY

Der griechische Alexanderroman. VON ADOLF AUSFELD; nach des Verfassers Tode herausgegeben VON WILHELM KROLL. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. xi + 253. M. 8.

Ausfeld's work on the Greek romance of Alexander the Great was left unfinished at his untimely death; and we owe it to the piety of Ulrich Bernays and the co-operation of Wilhelm Kroll that the manuscript was finished, corrected, and abridged for publication.

The book contains a statement of the manuscript relations which make it possible to establish the third-century A. D. text (pp. 8-28), a translation of this text (pp. 30-122), and a detailed historical commentary upon it (pp. 122-213). Single brackets are used in the translation to segregate what, in Ausfeld's judgment, is the story proper from the accretions which had been made before the end of the third century A. D.; double brackets to mark off passages interpolated in the accretions previous to that time. The original thus appears to have been a fairly well-written and self-consistent popular history which was composed in Alexandria at the time of the fifth Ptolemy. Into this narrative some ignorant but pretentious persons probably of the age of the Severi set letters, especially of Alexander and Aristotle, and, besides other episodes—such as a visit to Kandake, Queen of the Ethiopians—the description of a campaign in Greece which was undertaken by Alexander after he had overrun Rome, Carthage, Egypt, and Phoenicia, but before he had defeated Darius. The chief arguments for the analysis thus made are set forth by Ausfeld in a number of concluding essays (pp. 213-53).

The author has sought everywhere to establish real or reported facts as the points of departure for such incidents and episodes in the romance as are not mere errors of composition; and he holds the attitude and bias of Ptolemaic Alexandria mainly responsible for the shape these facts finally assumed. He has thus completed a necessary preliminary task, and obtained the convincing results that the book drew largely from the most

sensational histories of Alexander's achievements, and possesses a perceptible Ptolemaic flavor. It, accordingly, sought, or affected to seek, a reputation for veracity; but whether this was a genuine ambition, or a literary artifice, Ausfeld might have determined differently, had he lived to finish his work. He might then have trusted less in the good faith of the writer's sources; that is to say, given more weight in them to imaginative literature, to Schwartz's historical romances, or to Reitzenstein's *Aretalogie*, if not to Rohde's oriental folk-tales. He might even have come to feel less confidence about the separate existence and personality of any of the elements perceptible in the third-century A. D. text. As it is, his book is valuable to students of mediaeval and ancient literature in that it makes accessible for the first time a reliable interpretation of a work, which, translated, with adaptations, into Latin, Armenian, Syriac, Persian, Arabic, Ethiopian, Coptic, and practically every language of mediaeval Europe, was once known and popular from Naishapur to Nabata, from England to little Russia.

W. S. FERGUSON

C. Suetoni Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum Libri VIII. Recensuit
MAXIMILIANUS IHM. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. lxxvi+
376. M. 12.

This edition marks an advance over the edition of Roth, which, in spite of its shortcomings, has hitherto furnished the standard text of the author. Ihm has made use of a greater number of MSS than did Roth, has collated them more accurately, and in his text has frequently returned to the readings of the better MSS, discarding the conjectures of earlier editors, a method of procedure which might well have been carried to even greater length than it has been.

Ihm follows Traube in regarding as the archetype of the existing MSS the lost Fuldensis, written probably in rustic capitals, and used by Einhard in the preparation of the life of Charlemagne. This MS was loaned to Lupus Servatus, abbot of Ferrières, or a transcript of it was sent to him about 844, and is the source from which the numerous French MSS of the lives are derived, the Memmianus s. IX, written at Tours, the oldest and best of our MSS, being, perhaps, a direct copy of the transcript. Two other MSS, showing resemblances to the Memmianus but also divergences which make it unlikely that they were copied directly from the same MS as the Memmianus, are the Gudianus s. XI, the value of which is questioned by Ihm who doubts whether its superior readings were derived from the archetype, and the incomplete Vaticanus 1904, s. XI-XII, more accurate than the Gudianus but representing a copy of the transcript of the Fuldensis differing from the Memmianus. From a lost MS closely related to the Vaticanus Ihm derives a class

designated as X, represented in his collations by Laur. 68, 7, Paris. 5801, Laur. 66, 39, Montepess. 117, all of the twelfth century, and the Hulsianus of the fourteenth century. Another and inferior class, descended in a different line from the copy of Servatus, is designated as Y, and from its numerous representatives Ihm has selected three MSS of the twelfth century, Paris. 6116, Paris. 5802, and Regius 15 C III of the British Museum. In addition to these sources the editor has drawn on the excerpts of Heiric of Auxerre of the ninth century and those of the Notre Dame MS of the thirteenth century. The late MSS are disregarded as representative of the archetype, though not infrequently readings from them are adopted in the text as happy conjectures of fifteenth-century scholars.

The usefulness of the apparatus criticus is impaired by the necessity of consulting both apparatus and introduction for the readings even of the Memmianus, owing to the fact that the editor, to save space and repetition, has treated a number of general questions, including orthography, in the introduction.

The editor shows familiarity with the various articles on Suetonius, but in spite of the wealth of critical material at his disposal, the number of significant changes from the text of Roth is inconsiderable, many though not all of them showing a return to the readings of the archetype, even to the extent of introducing new difficulties and new lacunae in place of the conjectures or readings of inferior MSS adopted, often with considerable probability in their favor, by Roth.

In deference to the authority of archetype, inscriptions, or equally satisfactory evidence, some familiar names have disappeared; e.g., Iul. 25 *Gebenna* has given place to *Cebenna*; Tib. 65 villa *Iovis* to villa *Ionis*; Claud. 2 *Iulio* Antonio to *Iullo* Antonio; Nero 34 L. *Agerinum* to L. *Agermum*; Nero 50 *Ecloge* to *Egloge*, and everywhere *Aenobarbus* to *Ahenobarbus*, *Thrax* to *Thraex*, *Catthi* to *Chatti*, *Virgilius* to *Vergilius*, etc. On the same basis a reasonable uniformity of spelling has been adopted and forms probably used by Suetonius have been restored in opposition to the consensus of MSS reading or in spite of orthographical vagaries. Thus *incho* is everywhere read on the authority of Diomedes in place of *inchoo*, *cena* is everywhere substituted for *caena*, *-tt-* is read in the perfects *rettuli*, *attuli*, etc. The editor has possibly erred in not adopting what seems to have been a practice of Suetonius, in imitation of Varro, of writing *Hrodus*, *Hrianus*, *hrinoceeros*, since he is evidently convinced that they were so written by the author. The courage which leads an editor to write *Ptolemaeus* seven times in the face of an unvarying MSS tradition in favor of *Ptolomaeus*, to write *Sameramin* on the authority of a Sardinian inscription and of the Memmianus in which the form has been corrected by the second hand, and to assume that Suetonius invariably wrote the genitive of

proper nouns in *-ius* with a single *i*, in the face of the doubts that are even now being expressed as to Cicero's unvarying adherence to this form, might well have carried him through this minor difficulty.

Ihm has returned to the reading of the archetype in a number of cases in which the sense of the passage is either absolutely unaffected or only an insignificant change is introduced; e. g., Iul. 50, and in seven other places the form *sestertium* with numeral adverbs has been restored for conjectured *sestertii* or *sestertio*, Iul. 55 *oratorem quem* takes the place of the conjecture *oratorum quem*, Nero 22 *prasini* takes the place of *prasinum*, etc., but he has also repeatedly adopted conjectures or the readings of late MSS where at least a word can be said in favor of the older tradition, e. g., Aug. *eriperet* of the archetype is certainly possible, Tib. 27 *auctore eo senatum se audisse* is not an impossible reading, Tib. 59 *remedium* as a genitive plural occurs also in Apuleius, iota for epsilon iota in Greek words seems to be justified in Claud. 40, Dom. 10, etc., by the Graeco-Roman pun *arci* in Dom. 13 which is said in the text to be Greek, though no editor has ever paid any attention to the statement by writing it in Greek letters.

In considerably more than a hundred passages the readings of late MSS are still retained, often where no name of a fifteenth-century scholar can be cited as the author of the happy conjecture, although we are told that the fifteenth-century MSS are worthless, and if anyone ventures to call attention to the fact that of necessity many of the readings of these MSS must be adopted in any edition of Suetonius, he is assumed to mean that the fifteenth-century MSS are superior to the Memmianus.

The general appearance of the book is marred by the insertion in the text of various brackets and devices to indicate *omittenda*, *supplenda*, *lacunae*, and hopelessly corrupt passages. After once stating that he has everywhere adopted the single *i* in the genitive of proper nouns in *-ius*, the editor should not print in the text fifty or more instances of the double letter with the second *i* in brackets, nor indicate the insertion of a second *t* in *rettulit* and of an *h* in *Ahenobarbus* by another form of bracket after informing us that he has everywhere inserted those letters. Above all these indications of "*supplenda*" should not be extended to include references to modern books as though they had ever formed a part of the archetype. Many such references are to some collection of fragments, e. g., Baehrens *Fragmenta Poetarum Romanorum*, and lead only to the information that the fragment in question is due to the passage in Suetonius from which one has just turned.

The portraits of the different emperors at the beginning and end of the separate lives are but indifferently executed; the facsimiles of the Memmianus and of the Gudianus at the end of the volume are excellently done.

ALBERT A. HOWARD

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The Hibeh Papyri. Part I. Edited with Translations and Notes by BERNARD P. GRENFELL AND ARTHUR S. HUNT. With ten plates. (Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch.) London, 1906. Pp. xiv + 410. 45s. net.

In the number and antiquity of the literary papyri discussed, Grenfell and Hunt's *Hibeh Papyri* takes first rank among the fourteen volumes they have thus far published. One-third of the volume, which is reckoned a double volume in the publications of the Fund, is concerned with classical fragments, new and old, all dating from the third century B. C. Lysias and Epicharmus are represented among the new pieces, and perhaps also Sophocles (*Tyros*), Euripides (*Oeneus*), Philemon, and Hippias. There are also tragic, comic, and epic fragments even more difficult to assign. Not less interesting are the pieces of Homer, which present the strange deviations from the vulgate text previously exhibited by a few Ptolemaic fragments, notably those of Geneva. These are the occasion of a re-examination by the editors of the problem presented by these "eccentric" texts, with especial reference to Arthur Ludwich's recent treatise on the subject, in which he dismisses them as perversions of the vulgate, instead of being representatives of an equal or earlier type of text. From Ludwich's positions the Oxford editors dissent, pointing out that the increasing mass of eccentric evidence bears heavily upon his theory, and cannot be set aside as due to chance, while the currency, especially in inland Egypt, of non-vulgate texts prior to 200 B. C. must be freely admitted, whatever the age of the vulgate text itself. Grenfell and Hunt suspect the Alexandrian Museum of having had a hand in promoting the vulgate text to pre-eminence, if not of actually shaping that text.

Texts of nearly one hundred documents of the third century B. C., together with descriptions of half as many more, constitute the bulk of the volume. The first of these, a calendar for the Saite nome, is of especial interest for its connection with the astronomy of Eudoxus, by a follower of which it seems to have been composed. Royal ordinances, legal documents, letters, receipts, and accounts make up the remainder of a volume extraordinary in consisting exclusively of papyri of the third century B. C. Three appendices deal with the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars, the system of dating by the years of the king, and the eponymous priesthoods from 301-221 B. C. There are the usual elaborate indices.

The story of the finding of the Hibeh papyri gives an interesting glimpse of the papyrus excavator's method at its best. The Oxford excavators were drawn to the site in 1902, when a papyrus dealer came to them in the Fayûm offering for sale a mass of broken papyrus cartonnage. This, it was ascertained, came from the vicinity of Hibeh on the east bank of the Nile, not far above Benisuéf. Thither the excavators shortly

repaired, and devoted to the site the three weeks remaining of that season, returning to it for a month in the following winter, 1903. The papyri published in this volume were derived from mummy-cartonnage in part purchased from the itinerant dealer, in part dug up by Grenfell and Hunt in 1902. Those discovered in 1903 have not yet been examined. The site had suffered much from indiscriminate digging, the necropolis having been largely excavated by a native dealer in 1895-96. From his finds, it now appears, came certain literary pieces, notably three non-vulgate Homers, purchased by Grenfell and Hunt in Cairo in 1896 and published by them in that year, since further pieces of the same rolls were found on the spot in 1902.

Hibeh has been identified with the Egyptian Teuzoi, but its Graeco-Roman name has not been discovered. Hipponon and Agkuronopolis are possibilities, and between them it is probable that the remaining papyri from this fruitful site will make it possible to decide. Meantime the disastrous consequences of leaving papyrus sites to be ransacked by ignorant natives (who usually throw away papyrus-cartonnage as worthless), combined with the results of less than two months' excavating, should so stimulate interest in the Graeco-Roman Branch that the operations of Grenfell and Hunt in Egypt, now given over for lack of funds, may be promptly and extensively resumed.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Sophoclis Cantica. Digessit OTTO SCHROEDER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. vi+86. M. 2.40.

Professor Schroeder follows up his *Aeschyli Cantica* by a similar metrical analysis of the choruses of Sophocles. Even those who are unable to accept the "new *Metrik*" will be glad to see its principles systematically applied on a large scale to the texts. These schemes are certainly less intelligible to the average student than those of Schmidt in Jebb's *Sophocles*. There is no space here to inquire what is their rhythmical meaning, and to what precise differences in *viva voce* practice they point. Are we to accept literally the scheme for *O. T.* 463 ff.?

τίς ὄντιν' ἄ θεσπίει-
α Δελφίς εἶπε πέτρα
ἄρρητ' ἄρρητων τέλειαν-
τα φοινίαισι χερσίν;
 { / - - - - -
 { / - - - - -
 { / - - - - -
 { / - - - - -

Is there no hold or pause on *ἄ*, for example? Do the four short lines perceptibly break the unity of recitation, or are they written so merely to save space?

PAUL SHOREY

Topographie der Stadt Rom in Alterthum. VON H. JORDAN.
Erster Band, dritte Abtheilung, bearbeitet von Ch. Hülsen.
Berlin: Weidmann, 1907. Pp. xxiv + 709. M. 16.

When Jordan died in 1887, the completion of his famous work was intrusted to Hülsen who had just been appointed second secretary of the German Institute at Rome. His brilliant success as an epigraphist and topographer during the twenty years that have since elapsed is familiar to all students, and the long delay in the appearance of this book is easily explained when one considers the manifold duties and activities of the author and the constantly increasing additions to our knowledge of the subject, no small share of which is due to Hülsen himself. The delay due to the latter cause is shown by the fact that, while the printing began in 1901 and advance sheets of more than two hundred pages were in my hands in 1903, the book has only just appeared.

The material left by Jordan was neither sufficient nor suitable for the completion of his work, and Hülsen therefore determined to pursue his own method independently, so that the present volume is entirely his. It contains the detailed description and discussion of the topography and monuments of Rome except those that had been so treated by Jordan himself, namely the Forum, the imperial fora, the Forum Boarium and the Velabrum, the bridges and the aqueducts. With Lanciani's *Forma Urbis Romae*, it represents the most important contribution to the subject that has been made for a generation, and presents the views of the most authoritative of Roman topographers, based upon his own investigations. Nothing strikes the reader so forcibly as the fact that nothing has been taken on another's authority. All the sources seem to have been worked over anew, and the amount of labor involved can be appreciated only by those to whom the field is somewhat familiar. Furthermore, the sources are far more extensive than in Jordan's day, for Hülsen and Lanciani have been foremost in recognizing the amount and value of the information with regard to the monuments of Rome contained in the material of various sorts which has been left us by the architects and artists of the Renaissance and later centuries. This material has already led to the solution of several problems.

It is impossible here to enter into any criticism in detail of the many new and interesting views advanced in this book, and I will content myself with noting a few of those that have to do with the topography of the southern and central portion of the Campus Martius. In the *Notitia* is mentioned a *Crypta Balbi* which was naturally connected with the theatre of Balbus. In the via Calderari, immediately northwest of the theatre, remains of a two-storied structure existed in the sixteenth century which were identified with this *Crypta*. A few ruins still stand, but from the drawings and descriptions of Serlio and Bellori it appears that the

structure was open on all sides and consisted of colonnades and inner walls with niches, and interior rooms apparently without entrances. This seemed to justify the name, and the position close to the stage end of the theatre seemed to suggest its purpose. The building is indicated on a fragment of the Marble Plan but without name, and of course there was no certainty that it was the *Crypta*, although topographers have accepted Bellori's identification without question. Hülsen, however, on the strength of the ordinary use of *crypta* which means a closed and more or less subterranean structure, refuses to accept the current view, and identifies the ruins with the porticus Minucia vetus, a restoration by Domitian of the porticus Minucia of 110 B. C. This porticus is mentioned in the *Regionary Catalogue* next to the porticus Philippi, and therefore Hülsen maintains that its usual location near the piazza Montanara must be given up. Furthermore, the calendars seem to show that games in honor of Hercules Custos were celebrated near the porticus Minucia, and the transfer of this building necessitates a change in the location of the temple. Heretofore it has been supposed to have stood at the east end of the circus Flaminius, but Hülsen places it at the west end. Since Ovid speaks of the temple of Bellona as standing on the opposite side of the circus from the temple of Hercules Custos, the temple of this goddess also must be changed from the position hitherto assigned it at the north end of the circus to the east side. Thus the arrangement of the district about the circus Flaminius is materially altered.

A little to the north, the identification of the Hecatostylon with the remains of walls at the south end of the porticus Pompeiana is rejected, and this building is assigned to a location on the north side of the porticus. So, too, the current identification—always doubtful but usually accepted—of the basilica Neptuni with the remains of the great building that is part of the modern Bourse in the piazza di Pietra, is definitely thrown aside and Hülsen maintains that this structure is without doubt the Hadrianeum, a temple built by Antoninus Pius in 145 A. D. in memory of his father. Instead of the ordinary view that the Gymnasium was a separate building, erected by Nero on the site afterward occupied by the Stadium of Domitian, Hülsen believes it to have been merely a part of the *thermae* of Nero. He also maintains stoutly that there was a second cult-center of Mars in the northern part of the Campus Martius near the river, in addition to the ancient ara Martis near the piazza Venezia. For a criticism of this theory the reader is referred to Vol. III, p. 65, of this journal.

These illustrations will suffice to indicate how important the results of the author's conclusions often are, and it is evident that our maps of the ancient city must be considerably changed in some regions if these conclusions are valid. It is probable that the attention of topographers will be directed for some time to their careful examination. So far as I

have been able to subject them to such an examination, they have in most cases carried conviction—as was of course to be expected.

In a work of this sort, where there are so many hundreds of references of the most diverse kinds, it seems to be impossible to avoid errors of citation and there are a number in this book. They are usually of a sort to occasion but little inconvenience, and are relatively of no importance whatever. The exhaustive knowledge and critical acumen of the author arouse continual admiration.

S. B. P.

Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia. Band 3; Teil 2. "Der peloponnesische Krieg." Von GEORG BUSOLT. Gotha: Perthes, 1904. Pp. 591-1640. M. 18.

This volume which contains over one thousand pages is devoted entirely to the Peloponnesian War. In addition to a detailed table of contents, there are extremely useful chronological tables in which the events are assigned to months or seasons. In some respects there is a lack of uniformity. For example, one may well wonder why the production of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and *Thesmophoriazousae* is passed over, when such plays as the *Birds*, *Knights*, and *Peace* are included.

The plan of relegating to the generous footnotes criticisms and summaries of opposing theories may have some justification in the strictly narrative part of the work as a concession to a "wider circle of readers;" but it is certainly distracting in the chapter devoted to a discussion of the sources, where in many cases the notes are more useful than the text, which often merely serves to acquaint the reader with the subjects treated in the copious footnotes. The causes of the war are set forth clearly and due emphasis is placed on the commercial rivalry between Athens and Corinth, and the Athenian policy of coercing Megara so as to protect herself against invasion. Busolt has no theories to champion but contents himself with presenting the facts of the political and military history as brought out by the best modern research. He is sparing and sane in his criticisms of policies and plans of campaign. In regard to the Sicilian expedition he in the main approves of the views of Nicias, adding a few references to other writers who have undertaken to justify Athenian policy in Sicily. His conservative attitude toward conflicting modern theories is well illustrated in his discussion of the "Four Hundred" where he has done more than any of his predecessors to reconcile the opposing views of Koehler and Meyer and their followers. Occasionally his desire to present all the theories leaves the reader in doubt as to his own opinion. This is particularly noticeable in his treatment of Theramenes. He fully recognizes the existence of the Moderate party in Athens. The English reader is likely to be confused sometimes by his terminology. As a rule he

describes the extreme oligarchs as radicals, though he constantly refers to the extreme democrats as radical.

It is perhaps to be regretted that the limitations of space are partially responsible for his deferring the treatment of the "geistige Kämpfe" to the next volume. Certainly the Sicilian expedition and the revolution of the "Four Hundred" are much more intelligible if preceded by a discussion of the intellectual life of the period. An excellent feature of the work is the constant endeavor to keep before the reader the antecedents and personalities of even the less important public men.

In a work of such magnitude it is inevitable that each reader should find views that he cannot accept but it is beyond the scope of this review to record such dissents. In the matter of citing authorities Busolt is particularly generous and this volume, like its predecessors, will be the indispensable companion of all students of Greek history.

R. J. BONNER

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Demosthenes und Anaximenes: eine Untersuchung. Von WILHELM NITSCHKE, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1906. Pp. 111. M. 2.

This important treatise opens with a brief statement in regard to Anaximenes of Lampsacus, the variety and character of his literary activity, his relations to the Macedonian court, the peculiar history of his writings. It was long supposed that these existed only in fragments; then largely through the penetration of Spengel his Rhetoric was found classed as a work of Aristotle and apparently preserved through this error, and now again according to Nitsche Anaximenes regains his own from another source. The recently discovered commentary of Didymus upon Demosthenes has furnished much new evidence upon the relations of Demosthenes and Anaximenes and apparently gives good ground for the main contention of Nitsche's monograph, that Anaximenes is the real author of some of the works now included among the writings of the great orator. Several orations under the name of Demosthenes have long been regarded as spurious, some even from ancient times. Schaefer, some years ago, recognized that at least two of these were by the same author, but the identity of this orator remained unknown. Through the evidence presented by the Didymus commentary, supplemented by minute examination of the orations themselves, Nitsche seems to prove that Anaximenes is the author of the fourth Philippic, the *πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν Φιλίππου* and the *περὶ συντάξεως*. How did these speeches of Anaximenes become incorporated among the genuine orations of Demosthenes? Nitsche believes that Demosthenes' nephew Demochares soon after Demosthenes'

death gave to his friend Anaximenes the task of making a new and complete publication of the works of Demosthenes. This publication of his works was prompted largely by the desire to arouse new interest in the cause which Demosthenes had defended. As assistance toward this end Anaximenes, the master of imitation, composed and inserted three new orations, a pious fraud and one easy to accomplish in those uncritical times. The *προοίμια* are also the work of Anaximenes. Swoboda had already proved that they were not composed by Demosthenes. With the help of the Didymus commentary, says Nitsche, we know the author. The proof is less obvious in the case of the letters, but the hand of Anaximenes can be seen in these, and also elsewhere, e. g., the first speech against Aristogiton. The treatise closes with a brief reference to the new edition of Anaximenes' works by Wendland (1905), and to Rehdantz's *Philippics of Demosthenes* recently re-edited by Blass.

THEODORE C. BURGESS

BRADLEY POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
Peoria, Illinois

The Menexenus of Plato. Edited with Introduction and Notes
by J. A. SHAWYER, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.
Crown 8vo., pp. xxxi+49. \$0.50.

This little book reproduces Burnet's Oxford text of the *Menexenus*, adding a brightly written Introduction, in which the editor treats briefly of such matters as the occasion of the dialogue, its authenticity, the nature of the λόγος ἐπιτάφιος, its relation to history, and (summarizing Jebb) the growth of oratory and rhetoric; and concludes with brief notes following the text. There is no Index to text or notes, but the edition will serve the purposes of the student who desires to give the dialogue a hasty reading. Most of the errors noted in a rapid perusal have already been specified (by Professor Newhall, *Class. Jour.* II. 318) and need not be enumerated here. In his note on 238 *e* the editor says: "Plato wrote indifferently τὸ δοῖον καὶ μὴ and τὸ δοῖον καὶ τὸ μὴ. Cf. *Euthyphro* 9 *c*, 12 *e*." This might lead the student to conclude that instances of the latter usage were frequent; in fact they are rare. An interesting discussion of 238 *c d*, which corrects Shawyer's note *ad loc.*, is to be found in Hirzel's *Themis, Dike und Verwandtes*, p. 264, note. The editor appears not to have read Wendland's "Die Tendenz des platonischen *Menexenus*," *Hermes* XXXVI, and Trendelenburg's *Erläuterungen zu Platos Menexenus* (Berlin, 1905); but his book will doubtless be cordially welcomed by American teachers of Greek.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Der Enoplios. Ein Beitrag zur griechischen Metrik. Von. DR. E. HERKENRATH. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906. Pp. ix. + 186. M. 6.

The extraordinary industry and ingenuity bestowed upon this book make it, in accordance with the author's hope, a valuable repertory of metrical facts, even for those who cannot accept all of its conclusions. Starting from two forms of the Enoplios—Archilochus' Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε and Cratinus' Ἐρασμονίδη Βάθινπε which he proves to be equivalent by collecting all cases of their responsion—Dr. Herkenrath analyzes the entire body of extant Greek lyric and choric verse in order to establish two conclusions: (1) That Greek poetry allowed great freedom of equivalence and responsion, or, as he puts it, that the difference between a dissyllabic and a monosyllabic arsis (*Senkung*) concerns *Rhythmik* only, not *Metrik*. (2) That Greek lyric verses and strophes are largely composed of variations, extensions, curtailments, and combinations of a few favorite clauses or movements such as the Enoplios, the ithyphallic, the dochmiac, the Telesilleion, the Praxilleion, the Reizianum.

The first conclusion is *a priori* probable and is apparently confirmed by the unamended (or rightly amended!) tradition of the texts. There is no reason except convention or ἥθος for precise syllabic responsion in any poetry. The extent to which it may have been required by the tradition of a particular poetical form or the practice of a particular poet, is a question of special historical philology rather than of pure *Metrik*. Such freedoms of responsion as occur are as readily explained by the methods of Rossbach or Christ as by the new fashion of scanning by quadrisyllabic or larger groups. They are no argument for either system.

The second proposition is also true in the general statement (p. 167) "dass sich im Strophenbau gewisse Gewohnheiten erkennen lassen." But in the application it is liable to degenerate into a mere metrico-mathematical schematism bearing no relation to actual rhythmic utterance.

There is obviously no limit to the combinations which may be made if we may assume thirty-two forms of the "Enoplios" (Schroeder), substitute dactyls in the ithyphallic, call - - - | - - - a Telesilleion (p. 13), - - - - - a dochmiac, and - - - - - a Glyconic (pp. 17 ff.). But all metrical analogies and "Gewohnheiten" discovered by these purely schematic methods, must be verified by rhythmical considerations. I do not doubt that some of Dr. Herkenrath's groupings are valid rhythmically, and that he has satisfied his own ear of the validity of them all. But like others of the "New School," he assumes that the mere *metrical* analysis will be sufficient to convince his readers. It will not. To take a test case: His method leads him (p. 19) to establish an elaborate parallel between Eurip. *Herakles* 638 ff., and the "ganz ähnliches Lied," Aeschyl. *Ag.* 681 ff. Now these two odes may be like in terms of "gl. B," "gl. X,"

"gl. + en B," "en B + Reiz," etc. They are not in the least "like" in actual *viva voce* rhythmic reading. And there is something wrong in a system that identifies them. Dr. Herkenrath would probably not deny that similar or identical metrical groups may have a totally different rhythmical value in different contexts. But in the interest of working out his system he appears to forget it.

The valuable index is at first sight difficult to use owing to a number of arbitrary but ingenious abbreviations which when understood serve to present an enormous amount of information in brief compass.

PAUL SHOREY

Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit.

Mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften. Laut- und Wortlehre.

Von DR. EDWIN MAYSER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906. M. 14.

I undertake to notice briefly this book not as a specialist in the field of papyri literature, but as one of that larger number who have a keen interest in the history of the Greek κοινή, and wish to survey the important facts to be gleaned from the papyri, without attempting to follow in detail the formidable and ever-increasing mass of papyri publications. For all such this grammar of the papyri of the Ptolemaic period must be reckoned a most welcome and invaluable aid. It furnishes an exhaustive and orderly exhibit of the facts so far as they fall under the heads of *Lautlehre* and *Wortlehre*, the latter including *Flexion* and *Stammbildung*. In the introduction and under *Stammbildung* are also mentioned many peculiarities of vocabulary, words otherwise poetical or dialectic, new words, and new or unusual meanings. The Syntax is, we assume, reserved for a subsequent volume. The printing and general execution of the work are excellent but for one fault which it shares with too many other, especially German, publications. The numbered sections are long, with numerous subdivisions, sometimes covering a half-dozen pages or more, and the resulting inconvenience in looking up the cross-references is not even mitigated by repeating the section numbers at the top of each page.

On the general question of the source of the κοινή, the author's investigation has led him to the same position as that held by Thumb and the majority of the scholars at present, namely that it is a modified Attic. But he thinks Thumb has erred in seeking connection with the most vulgar type of colloquial Attic, as represented in the vase inscriptions. Certainly it was not this, but the Attic of literature and more cultivated speech, which set the standard. With its spread this was more and more affected by colloquial usage, not pre-eminently that of Athens, but by that of various parts of the Greek world. As regards the traces of the

old non-Attic dialects the author concludes that, with the exception of Ionic, they are so slight as to be negligible, and even the Ionic element he is disposed to reduce to the minimum. And if, in the case of certain forms, his skepticism of their ultimate Ionic source seems overdrawn, it is obviously true, and quite natural, that the Egyptian *κοινή* followed the Attic norm more closely and was less affected by distinctively non-Attic influences than we find to be the case with the contemporaneous *κοινή* inscriptions from other parts of the Greek world, where non-Attic dialects were indigenous.

But there was no lack of organic change, which in some respects went on more rapidly than in Attic, for example in vowel pronunciation, where the leveling in quantity, due to the substitution of a stress-accent, and the initial stages in the movement toward itacism, are evidenced by widespread confusion in spelling from the third and second centuries B. C. Even the sporadic cases of confusion, as between η and ν , or α and ν , have more significance than the author seems disposed to accord them. They show that the more advanced stages of itacism were not unknown in the extreme vulgar pronunciation, though not yet widely current.

In all such matters, too numerous to comment upon farther, the book offers an unrivaled collection of material, and is certain to be recognized as one of the chief sources for the study of the *κοινή*.

CARL DARLING BUCK

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

De quelques innovations de la déclinaison latine. Par A. MEILLET. Paris: Klincksiek, 1906. Pp. 47. Fr. 2.

After a chapter upon the general conditions which account for the "instabilité des formes latines" the author reviews the principal innovations which characterize the Latin declensional system. Although the history of most of these is not subject to controversy, there are several new suggestions, of which we note with interest, if not with complete conviction of its correctness, the contention that the *-em* of *hostem*, etc., is not due to the analogy of consonant stems, but comes from *-im* by phonetic change.

C. D. B.

Petite phonétique comparée des principales langues européennes.

Par PAUL PASSY. Leipsic et Berlin: Teubner, 1906. Pp. 132.

This little manual by the most eminent French phonetist addresses itself primarily to teachers of the modern languages, and deals mainly with the pronunciation of French, English, and German. But such a minute and competent analysis of language as actually spoken cannot fail to be of interest and value to all students of language.

C. D. B.

ΠΕΡΙ ΙΕΡΩΣΤΗΝΗΣ (*De Sacerdotio*) of St. John Chrysostom.

By J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN. (Cambridge Patristic Texts.)

Cambridge University Press, 1906. Pp. lviii+192. 6s.

Chrysostom's treatise *On the Priesthood* is recognized as the most important ancient discussion of the Christian ministry. It is of further interest as bearing upon a notable crisis in Chrysostom's career, when he beguiled his friend Basil into accepting the episcopal office, while he refused it for himself, as a dignity of which he was not worthy. The treatise, while written some years after the action, is in a sense an apology for it, being cast in the form of a dialogue between Chrysostom and Basil, upon the dignity and duties of the priestly office.

The present edition is designed for the use of theological students, for whom the work possesses a natural interest and value. Dr. Nairn's edition is not, however, a mere reprint of the treatise with a few notes. On the contrary, he has subjected the chief manuscripts to a critical examination, upon which he has based his text and apparatus of readings. These thirty manuscripts are listed and described, and the way is pointed to other manuscripts of the treatise still awaiting examination. The introduction includes further a survey of the earlier editions of the *De Sacerdotio*, of the several versions into which it has passed, and a brief discussion of its occasion, and date, which is placed between 386, when Chrysostom became a presbyter, and 390, soon after which date Jerome makes use of the treatise. The text is accompanied by brief notes, and there is an index of the more important Greek words. The entire absence of any suitable lexicon to accompany the study of the text recalls the important enterprise of Dr. Redpath and Professor Swete, who have recently undertaken the preparation of a patristic lexicon.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Tragedies of Seneca. Translated into English verse by

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER. Chicago: The University of Chicago

Press, 1907. Pp. x+534. \$3 net.

The present generation, accustomed to the power of Stephen Phillips and the artistic charm of Mackaye, is but little moved by the lifeless rhetoric of Seneca. His moralistic platitudes seem tedious, his epigrams and paradoxes trite, and his sensational scenes melodramatic, and gory as the sands of the Colosseum. Yet Professor Miller in his excellent translation of the tragedies has succeeded in accomplishing the task of giving new life and interest to these products of the rhetoric of the early Roman Empire. Not only has he treated the plays with rare appreciation, but he has been effectively aided by his familiarity with modern

literature. Here and there some poet's phrase enriches the original with its associations, such as Phthlegethon's "waves of fire" (*Thy.* 74), or "the sceptered king" (*Oed.* 242). He has also rendered the tragedies more enjoyable to English readers by adding comparative analyses of the Senecan dramas and the Greek originals, and his mythological index will help to make them more intelligible to those whose memory for the details of the myths is fleeting. Professor Manly's introductory essay on the influence of Seneca upon the early English drama, interesting though it be, is too brief to deal adequately with this subject.

Professor Miller has used Leo's text (Berlin, 1878-79) as the basis of his translation, and has noted carefully all variations from it. Where he differs from Leo, he has almost always taken the conservative position. He has often refused to accept conjectures, as Bothe's correction of *cibus* (*Phaedr.* 208) to *scyphus*, and Leo's assignment of Medea's words *si regnas, iube* (*Med.* 194) to Creon, as well as his more radical changes, as in *Phaedr.* 1118. On the other hand, his insertion of *haud* in *Tro.* 982 is quite unwarranted, and he has too often rejected the reliable Codex Etruscus in favor of the untrustworthy interpolator, as in *luxus* for *cursus* (*Phaedr.* 449), and in the words *Medea fugiam?* (*Med.* 171), where Leo, following E, reads *NUT. Medea-MED. Fiam.*, a terseness and pregnancy of expression far more characteristic of Seneca.

In his meters the translator has been singularly successful. In the speeches he has used the iambic pentameter, except in the *Medea*, where he has imitated the trimeter of the original. This he regards as an experiment of doubtful success, but when once the long line has grown familiar, it reproduces effectually the dignity and stateliness of the Latin. Some of the choral meters also are happily imitated, as the anapaests in *Oed.* 436 f.—

A furious Maenad, the comrade of Bacchus,
In garment of fawn-skin conducted the god;

and the lightness of the epithalamium in *Med.* 75 f. is well rendered in

The fairest of girls is she,
The Athenian maidens outshining,
Or the Spartan maiden with armor laden,
No burden of war declining.

The effect of the asclepiads of the invocation in this epithalamium is successfully given by dactyls, but the iambic tetrameters, which take the place of the asclepiads in *Thy.* 122 f., are too short and do not reproduce the stately movement of this solemn entrance. Unfortunately no attempt has been made to imitate the trochees which express Creon's terror at the recollection of his interview with the Pythia (*Oed.* 223 f.).

A translation of Seneca's tragedies must be in the main a translation of wordy declamation and detailed description. It is hard to prevent the characters of these dramas from ranting, but Professor Miller has succeeded in avoiding exaggerations, and in restraining the tone of the

speeches where the bombast might easily become ridiculous. He has been able to save pathos from being swallowed up in rhetoric, as in Medea's plea to Creon (*Med.* 203 f.), and in the dignified translation of Oedipus' prayer (*Oed.* 247 f.) the doomed monarch seems every inch a king. In the long descriptive passages the translator has usually succeeded in imitating the effect of weirdness and mystery, which is so characteristic of Seneca's descriptions. The beginning of Theseus' story of his descent into Hades (*H. F.* 664 f.) is a fair example—

The realm of hated Dis
Opes wide its mouth; the high cliff spreads apart,
And in a mighty cavern yawns a pit
With jaws portentous, huge, precipitous.

Here "a watery gleam of daylight follows in," which is a worthy rendering of *tenuis relictæ lucis a tergo nitor*, and the almost Miltonic description of the "water of oblivion," *placido quieta labitur Lethe vado* is happily imitated in "with peaceful shallows gentle Lethe glides." Some sacred grove was a favorite subject for such pictures, and Seneca used all his powers to describe the one which stood behind the palace at Argos (*Thy.* 650 f.). Professor Miller's translation of this bit of word-painting is a masterpiece.

An oozy stream springs there beneath the shade,
And sluggish creeps along within the swamp,
Just like the ugly waters of the Styx
Which bind the oaths of heaven. 'Tis said that here
At dead of night the hellish gods make moan.
And all the grove resounds with clanking chains,
And mournful howl of ghosts. Here may be seen
Whatever, but to hear of, causes fear.

By skilful use of adjectives he quite reproduces, and even enhances, the gloomy atmosphere of the original.

Perhaps the *sententiae* and the epigrams with which these tragedies sparkle present the greatest difficulty to the translator. It is hard to be as terse in English as in Latin. Professor Miller has, however, usually been successful. His "No crime's avenged save by a greater crime" is as brief and pointed as Seneca's *scelera non ulcisceris, nisi vinces*, and the antithesis of

Age, anime, fac quod nulla posteritas probet,
Sed nulla taceat (*Thy.* 192, 193.)

is well rendered in

But come, my soul, do what no coming age
Shall ne'er approve—or e'er forget.

On the other hand, the brevity and balance of *leve est miseria ferre, perferre est grave* (*Thy.* 307) are lost in

'Tis easy to bear hardship for a time;
But to endure it long is an irksome task;

and the lines

Never has for long
Unbridled power been able to endure,
But lasting sway the self-controlled enjoy

lack the terseness of Seneca's

Violenta nemo imperia continuit diu,
moderata durant. (*Tro.* 258, 259.)

Occasionally the translator fails to bring out the full force and exact meaning of the original. So the lines

The more should fortune's favorite . . . fear the gods
Who have uplifted him above his mates

do not quite express the thought contained in *metuentem deos nimium faventes* (*Tro.* 262, 263), where the main idea seems to lie, not in *deos*, but in *nimium faventes*. It is not the gods that Pyrrhus is advised to fear, but the excessive prosperity which they have bestowed on him, and the impending *φθόρος*. In the same way the full ghastliness of *Thy.* 277, 278:

Liberos avidus pater
gaudensque laceret et suos artus edat

is lost in the translation

Let once again
A sire with joyous greed his children rend
And hungrily devour *their* flesh.

Thyestes is to devour his *own* flesh in devouring the children. But such instances are rare and unimportant.

Professor Miller has written a truly poetical translation, and one which will stand the test of time. He has skilfully reproduced the merits of the tragedies, and has carefully avoided exaggerating their defects. He has translated thoughts, not words, and has rendered the spirit as well as the content of the original, using to advantage his knowledge of poetry, and his mastery of metrical forms. His translation seems destined to stimulate a new interest in these old dramas, which have so important a place in the history of European literature.

DAVID MAGIE, JR.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Altgriechische Plastik. Von DR. WILHELM LEBMANN. Munich: Beck, 1907. Pp. xiv+231, with 20 colored plates, and 79 halftones in the text. M. 30.

This handsome quarto is devoted to the history of sculpture on the Greek mainland from its beginnings in the seventh century down to about the middle of the fifth century, B. C. The scope of the work may

be inferred from the titles of the chapters, which are as follows: I, Archaic Sculpture in Poros; II, III, The Nude Male Figure and the Draped Female Figure in Archaic Art; IV, The "Archaic Smile;" V, VI, The Rendering of the Hair on Male and Female Figures of Earlier Greek Art; VII, VIII, The Nude Male Figure and the Female Figure in the Transitional Period; IX, Greek Reliefs in the Earlier Period; X, Greek Pediment Sculptures.

The author, Dr. Lermann, is unknown to me. He avows himself a disciple of the modern school of Greek archaeologists, as whose chiefs he names Brunn, Lange, and Furtwängler—the school which studies Greek art as art, and not chiefly as a branch of classical philology or antiquities. He has evidently received a thorough training, and although for parts of his work he acknowledges special indebtedness to predecessors, as Lange and Lechat, he everywhere writes with the assurance of mastery. If his text lacks the novelty and illumination of Lange's great essay on "The Rendering of the Human Figure in Earlier Greek Art," it may be commended for numerous valuable detailed observations and for prevailing good judgment.

What lends the book especial distinction and makes it indispensable to any well-equipped library is the series of twenty colored plates giving in actual size the painted patterns on the dresses of the archaic female statues of the Athenian acropolis. The originals of these plates were executed by Dr. Lermann himself in 1904 at a cost of several months' exacting labor. The task seems to have been performed with admirable fidelity. The result is an invaluable record of a precious group of facts illustrating the polychromy of Greek sculpture.

F. B. TARBELL

Scopas et Praxitèle. Par MAXIME COLLIGNON. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1907. Pp. 175, and 24 full-page illustrations. Fr. 4.50.

This is one of a series of popular little books entitled "Les Maîtres de l'Art," which are coming out concurrently with the similar series of "Les Grands Artistes." As its subtitle indicates, it deals not only with Scopas and Praxiteles, but with Greek sculpture generally from the beginning of the fourth century B. C. to the time of Alexander. M. Collignon, author of the excellent *Histoire de la sculpture grecque*, knows his subject well. He makes few positive mistakes, inclines to be interrogative regarding rash theories, and writes with a characteristically French charm of style. The body of his text is divested of all learned apparatus, but an eight-page bibliography at the end gives ample guidance to an inquiring student.

F. B. TARBELL

The Art Institute of Chicago: Illustrated Catalogue of the Antiquities and Casts of Ancient Sculpture in the Elbridge G. Hall and other collections. Part I, Oriental and Early Greek Art; Part II, Early Greek Art. By ALFRED EMERSON. Chicago, 1906, 1907. Pp. 237, with 31 plates and numerous text illustrations.

The title of Dr. Emerson's catalogue is somewhat misleading, for with the exception of two pages devoted to a summary description of original Egyptian antiquities, the two parts which have been issued are concerned only with casts of ancient works. Probably the later parts will justify the double title. The casts of works of oriental art are very briefly described, the greater part of the two volumes (pp. 33-237) being devoted to casts of early Greek sculpture, down to about the middle of the fifth century. Here the treatment is much fuller. After an excellent "Brief Account of the History of Greek Sculpture" (pp. 33-58), the separate casts are described in rough chronological order. The description often goes far beyond the monument under discussion. So the accounts of the Lion Gate at Mycenae and the pedimental sculptures from the temple of Aphaia are really short essays, delightfully written, on the prehistoric art of Greece and the accomplishments of the Dorian school of athletic sculpture. Dr. Emerson's wide knowledge of the history of art and his keen observation of life frequently appear in unexpected, but always apt, allusions and parallels.

In detail the two volumes are open to some adverse criticism. It is disturbing to find the same work referred to as Von Mach, Mach, and University Prints; Overbeck, GGP¹ I, fig. 19a will hardly be clear to the uninitiated; and in general the references to publications would be much more useful if they were less abbreviated, or better still, if a list of abbreviations were given. Mykenai and Mycenian (p. 38) cannot be called consistent, especially in view of the form Mykenian, which appears a few pages later (p. 60). Many of these disturbing features are doubtless due to careless proofreading, of which other evidences are only too frequent.

But these, after all, are points of minor importance, which can be remedied in later editions. The Catalogue will undoubtedly add much to the pleasure of visitors to the Art Institute, and with its numerous illustrations, it may well be used by students of ancient art elsewhere.

GEORGE H. CHASE

